Washington State
Department of Transportation

WSF Keystone Project
Scoping Outreach and Comment Summary

PROJECT BACKGROUND

Washington State Ferries (WSF) is developing the Keystone Project to maintain existing service and accommodate future growth on the Keystone-Port Townsend route. Currently the small Steel Electrics are the only vessels that can fit in Keystone Harbor's narrow entrance and shallow water. They have pre-World War II vintage car decks and riveted steel hulls, limited car and passenger carrying capacity, are nearing the end of their useful life and need to be replaced. In addition, aging terminal structures at Keystone require preservation work, and increased vehicle holding capacity is needed to accommodate future growth in ridership. Operational reliability can also be improved to reduce cancelled sailings.

In January 2005, the Keystone Harbor Study identified four preliminary harbor/vessel options for further study. The options were developed in concert with the Keystone Community Advisory Group (CAG) that met from June through December 2005. These options are now being carried forward as preliminary alternatives in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The environmental review is part of a process regulated by the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). It began in March 2006 with an official scoping comment period, which is summarized in this document.

The four preliminary alternatives under review are:

A. Relocate the jetty 300 feet to the east and widen the harbor to the east to accommodate a larger vessel. The larger vessel would have a capacity of between 124-144 vehicles.

B. Extend the jetty 600 feet into the water and widen the harbor to the west to accommodate a larger vessel. The larger vessel would have a capacity of between 124-144 vehicles.

C. Use the existing harbor and acquire new, unique vessels with a special propulsion system that would allow them to operate in the existing Keystone Harbor.

D. Use the existing harbor and terminal and acquire new vessels that are similar in size to the existing Steel Electrics (approximately 65-car capacity).

No Action Alternative. The No Action alternative is used as a baseline for the EIS. It allows WSF to compare the other alternatives to what would happen in the future if the project were not constructed.

WHAT IS SCOPING?

The purpose of scoping is to allow the public, agencies and interested parties to comment on the scope or range of issues to be addressed in the EIS. The Keystone Project scoping period ran from March 28, 2006 to April 28, 2006. Sixty-two comments from the public, local and federal agencies and tribes were received during this period. Comments could be submitted via e-mail, mail, phone, or in person at a scoping open house.

Scoping Meetings
A public scoping open house was held on March 29 to introduce the preliminary alternatives and gather public comment. The meeting was held at Coupeville Elementary School (6 South Main Street) in Coupeville. Open house attendees were encouraged to give their comments by completing a comment form or providing oral comments to a court reporter. Complete details on how the meeting was publicized, methods for providing comment and informational handouts provided at the open house can be found in the attached appendices. An agency and tribal scoping meeting was held on April 6th, and was open to representatives of agencies and tribes affected by the project. Twenty-seven representatives from agencies and tribes attended the meeting that included a site tour of Keystone Harbor.

SUMMARY OF SCOPING COMMENTS RECEIVED

WSF received 62 comments about the Keystone Project during the 30-day scoping period:

- ✓ 14 emails from individual members of the public
- ✓ 15 comment forms, submitted at the public scoping meeting and sent following the public meeting through the mail
- ✓ 3 written comments from members of the public, submitted by mail
- ✓ 6 comments submitted in person through community briefings
- ✓ 17 comments were provided by agency and tribal representatives either at the agency scoping meeting or via formal written comment
- ✓ 7 comments were submitted orally to the court reporter at the open house.

Upon receipt of comments, each was entered into a comment database and categorized to assist summary and comment organization.

Overall, there was no one topic or theme that rose as a major area of concern in these comments. Areas frequently mentioned included:

- **Preliminary Alternatives** (Alternatives A – D, as well as references to an out-of-harbor alternative)
- **Wildlife and Natural Environment** (including wildlife and vegetation, and Crockett Lake)
- **Parks and Recreation** (including Ebey's Landing National Historic Reserve, Keystone Underwater Park, Fort Casey State Park campground, and Fort Casey State Park boat launch)
- **Vessels/Operations** (referencing the type/size of vessels, fleet interchangeability, holding area, and service/frequency)
- **Quality of Life** (with mention of traffic, growth projections, visual quality/aesthetics and public safety)

The following section describes the types of comments related to these common categories and includes samples of comments related to each topic. Full text of all comments can be found in the attached appendix.

Preliminary Alternatives

Comments related to the preliminary alternatives reflected opinions on each of the four alternatives (A-D), as well as comments that suggested an out-of-harbor alternative for the EIS.

Alternative A

The comments regarding Alternative A were mixed, although there was a tendency towards concern for potential impacts to marine life inhabiting the area. The following comments reflect this theme:

> *The addition of a fish passage in Alternative A is very appealing.*
>
> *What is the estimate for the amount of time the jetty will need to re-colonize if it is relocated [under Alternative A]?*
>
> *Alternative A would result in disruption of existing habitat on and adjacent to the jetty.*
>
> *[I'm] very concerned with impacts associated with Alternative A due to potential impacts to the area to the south of the terminal which has unique ethnobotany.*

Other comments raised issues about Alternative A's impacts to vehicle holding and increased traffic; examples can be found under "Quality of Life."

Alternative B

Comments that mentioned Alternative B generally related to the resulting habitat changes from extending the jetty, and provided both positive and negative views of the alternative. They included:

If it can be done in a manner with limited impact, I am in full support of extending the jetty as proposed in Option B. This could make for an even nicer habitat.

The building of a 600-foot jetty would adversely affect the marine environment by causing a 6-acre footprint new to the bottom of the Sound.

Option B will not disrupt the dive site but will result in major unknown and unpredictable environmental changes to the harbor.

Alternative B, like Alternative A, also had comments referencing vehicle holding and traffic as a result of a larger vessel serving the route. Examples of these comments can be found under "Quality of Life."

Alternatives C and D
Alternatives C and D were generally referenced in unison, and are therefore closely connected in this summary. Alternatives C and D were largely supported in comments, due to the potential sailing frequency on the route.

Both options C and D involve the use of smaller boats, which will preserve the existing schedule.

I'm in favor of option C because there would be two ferries running, which would continue the walk-on service as it is and improve car service.

Alternative C and D are acceptable – smaller ferries, continue sail schedule.

Other comments seemed to favor Alternatives C and D because of the resulting impacts on the natural environment, relative to other alternatives. Examples of these comments can be found under "Wildlife and Natural Environment."

Out of Harbor Alternative
Comments regarding an alternative outside the harbor generally came from agencies and not from the general public. Though not a frequent concern for commenters, these comments suggested that studying an out-of-harbor option would allow for a more accurate analysis of environmental impacts. Other comments stated they were glad WSF had dropped an out-of-harbor option from the analysis.

We are glad that you have dropped any options that involved relocating the terminal farther east on Keystone spit, which would destroy an entirely new area, and require changes to the highway.

The environmental process is being short-circuited if an "out-of-the-harbor" option is not considered.

The Corps may ask WSF to consider an "out-of-the-harbor" option to meet NEPA requirements.

Is WSF at risk if it does not consider the "out-of-the-harbor" option?

What are the advantages of staying in the harbor vs. going outside the harbor?

Wildlife and Natural Environment

Comments regarding wildlife, vegetation, and Crockett Lake all fall under Wildlife and Natural Environment. These comments generally focused upon the potential changes to Keystone Spit, Crockett Lake, and surrounding marine waters as a result of WSF's alternative choice for Keystone Terminal.

Wildlife and Vegetation

Many of the comments concerned with wildlife and vegetation were focused on marine life, especially around the jetty. These comments included:

Look at the impact of extending the jetty on communities and organisms that live along or near it.

We are very concerned about this wonderful dive site being destroyed by relocating the jetty. The underwater animal and plant life is incredible there and would take years to regenerate.

What are the likely effects to the natural area east of the boat launch?

Crockett Lake

Most comments regarding Crockett Lake dealt with potential impacts to the diverse marine and island wildlife that reside there. Several worried about potential impacts to the lake and the connection with Keystone Harbor, and suggested mitigation ideas.

Crockett Lake provides a nursery for salmon – WEAN is concerned about the impacts to the lake with any alternative.

The potential for improving the salmon habitat value of Crockett Lake at some time in the future should be considered during planning for this project.

What impact would a larger ferry have on Crockett Lake when slowing and discharging a larger body of water?

Mitigation that WDFW would ask for concerning the Keystone Ferry Project will likely include a project by WSF to restore the saltwater connection between Crockett Lake and Keystone Harbor.

[The Trust Board] would like to see Crockett Lake revitalized and free-flowing, to provide a tidal area for salmon habitat. Please do not foreclose the ability to change the connection to Crockett Lake for any alternative.

Parks and Recreation

Parks and recreation comments related to the many activities and recreational resources available surrounding Keystone Ferry Terminal today, and potential impacts to them as a result of any of the alternatives. These resources include Ebey's Landing National Historic Reserve, Keystone Underwater Park, Fort Casey State Park campground, and the Fort Casey State Park boat launch.

Ebey's Landing National Historic Reserve

Many of the comments that mentioned Ebey's Landing also mentioned other concerns in the park. Most comments mentioned the entirety of the reserve in passing, while focusing on various impacts on specific locations.

> *The Quartermaster Dock, east of the jetty is a contributing resource to the Central Whidbey Island Historic District. Other features of the Fort Casey complex, such as the Powerhouse and portions of the roadway and pedestrian circulation network are significant and should be retained or at least considered during the development and assessment of a preferred alternative.*
>
> *There is a need [in Alternatives A and B] to consider indirect impacts on national historic areas in the vicinity of the project. The historic character of the visitor's experience could be affected by additional traffic.*
>
> *I just hope we can preserve this area and not let more commuter car and truck traffic distract from the beauty of Ebey's Prairie.*

Keystone Underwater Park

Most of the comments mentioning the dive park in the Keystone Conservation Area expressed concern regarding impacts to the natural setting and ecosystem that has developed around the jetty, as well as access to the dive park itself.

> *Keystone is a top dive destination in the Pacific Northwest. …The strong current environment at Keystone creates a challenge for ferry traffic, but those same nutrient-rich currents have nourished an incredible abundance of marine life in the 55 years since the jetty was constructed.*
>
> *Moving the jetty would deprive divers of one of the best dive areas in the state for the next 50 years as the slow growing and territorial organisms slowly return to the new jetty.*

Fort Casey State Park Campground

Of the comments mentioning Fort Casey State Park, many were concerned with the potential loss of the campground due to alterations to the harbor.

> *Encroachment of terminal improvements into the operations of Ft. Casey State Park should be kept to a minimum.*

Would removal and export of the Fort Casey State Park camping area under Option B require armoring of the remaining shoreline (sheet piles or seawall) to protect the upland from erosion due to ferry propulsion and wind-wave action?

Relocation of the existing jetty may have an effect on depositional sediments and the frequency and volume of dredging of the harbor. The impacts of this ongoing maintenance dredging on the underwater park resources of Fort Casey State Park should be assessed and adequate mitigation proposed.

Fort Casey State Park Boat Launch
As with comments regarding the Fort Casey campground, comments having to do with the boat launch were primarily concerned with the potential loss of the facility.

This alternative (C) seems the wisest because the park for campers remains and the boat launch remains.

Lots of people use both the overnight camp area and the boat launch - both are very useful and unique spots - don't reduce them.

A public boat ramp is situated on the east side of the harbor and is very popular with the boating public. What would the short-term and long-term impacts to users of this facility be under each of the alternatives?

Vessels/Operations
Vessels/operations comments encompass all comments related to the type of vessel used on the Keystone-Port Townsend route, as well as holding area and sailing frequency.

Type/Size of Vessel
Many comments were made regarding the type and size of vessels in the preliminary alternatives. There were some general questions, and many dealing with specific impacts of different vessel types. As observed in comments related to Alternatives C and D, many comments expressed interest in a smaller vessel.

Alternatives C and D are a choice of vessels – is it a choice of cost, or are you considering other factors?

Even though WSF seems to have already decided on a vessel, the small boats seem to be the best choice.

Option C carries no environmental risk, allows for increased ferry capacity, could likely be implemented more quickly, and is an opportunity for WSF to use the uniqueness of Keystone Harbor to develop the ferry of the future.

100 car ferries are big enough and the harbor doesn't have to change [under Alternative C].

We need a bigger boat such as the Evergreen State class [which would be possible under Alternative A]. Three more feet of draft, yet it can carry 25 more vehicles.

Fleet Interchangeability

Other areas of interest were the standardization of the WSF fleet and the role Keystone might play in that. Some of these comments reflected confusion regarding interchangeability, while others called for a standardized fleet.

I believe it is important to standardize your fleet when you retire the old class of ferries.

WSF needs a new vessel for all of the options – it just depends if it's one that works for the rest of the fleet or if it is a unique vessel that would only be used in Keystone. Is this true?

Would the vessels for alternatives C and D be interchangeable with any of the fleet?

Service/Frequency

Many of the comments that had to do with WSF operations on the Keystone-Port Townsend route focused on the frequency of vessel crossings as a result of the different alternatives. In these cases, there was strong support for more frequent service.

The larger boat option would gain support if the schedule improved or ran later!

If they were planning on running two of the large boats with that other option [option A or B] and the service is actually going to improve for the summer runs, then I could see that it would probably be a reasonable situation.

The gaps in the schedule [today] often make it difficult to find a sailing time that is anywhere close to the timing of what we need to do on the Whidbey side.

Holding Area

Of the comments having to do with vehicle holding, there was a significant concern about the amount of area at the terminal required for vehicles on a larger vessel.

Do you need a larger holding area for a larger boat?

Will queuing still occur in these harbor/vessel scenarios, or will all vehicles be held in the expanded holding area?

Larger vessels would mean less frequent sailings every 90 minutes which would cause greater holding areas on both sides.

[There are] secondary impacts of increased traffic on local roads [as a result of larger vessels] – the project will result in the need to widen several roads in this area.

Quality of Life

Quality of life comments included concerns related to the "upland" area and Town of Coupeville as a result of the changes to Keystone Ferry Terminal. These comments included references to traffic, growth projections, public safety, and visual quality/aesthetics of the area and terminal itself.

Traffic

Of the comments regarding traffic, many dealt with increased vehicle off-loading from larger vessels as a result of a new or reconfigured terminal on central Whidbey Island; others related to overall growth and resulting traffic increases.

Increased traffic affects our way of life.

The last two alternatives (C and D) are really unacceptable because the boats would be too small for the projected traffic increase.

By using the 130 car ferry every hour and a half a major concern is the influx of vehicular traffic into Port Townsend at one time [for both Alternatives A and B].

Growth Projections

Comments regarding growth projections related to skepticism about WSF's projections and the need for larger boats. These comments were divided, with some supporting WSF's projections and expressed necessity for larger vessels and general expansion of the terminal. Others offered alternative scenarios.

Would question the projected population and ridership growth. No new industries being established in nearby areas. Tourism may not rise to projected levels as cost of fuel increases, economy (possibly) declines.

Growth will occur in the long-term. A bigger boat seems like a good option.

The projected ridership is based solely on population growth and does not take into account changing behavioral patterns. We already have seen a reduction in ridership.

Public Safety

Several comments indicated concern surrounding the traffic passing by and through the high school and middle school campus on the way to Coupeville.

Currently (the middle and high school students) walk up to the corner and cross at the crosswalk there. We have had several incidences of close encounters

between automobiles and students. No one has been seriously injured, but my concern is that it's just a matter of time.

The traffic flow, there will be more and more going right through Coupeville instead of on the highway where it really should be. They go by a college campus, high school and elementary school, summer camp, all of which have a lot of kids right near the road. And sooner or later something bad is going to happen as a result of that.

Visual Quality/Aesthetics

Visual quality and aesthetics comments range from the panoramic view near Keystone Harbor, to more specific comments related to terminal design.

The present terminal is ugly. We can do better and should be part of the new design.

We do not consider the Keystone location to be ordinary, rather, quite extraordinary, and one of the jewels of Island County through its vista, relationship to a major State Park, and unparalleled habitats. This should be placed well above organizational needs that would standardize the Washington State Ferries fleet.

A design charrette would be a great idea for this project.

The environmental assessment must document the rural and open character of the site. Further, mitigative actions need to be identified that will assure that development associated with the site, does not adversely affect the rural historic district – including elements such as traffic control devices and facilities.

NEXT STEPS

WSF plans to consider all comments received during the scoping period in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, currently slated for early 2007.

In the coming months, WSF will compile additional information on the potential impacts of the preliminary options in discipline reports. WSF will continue to work with the Town of Coupeville, other agencies, tribes and community groups to address traffic and environmental concerns. The results of the environmental studies will be available at a community open house when the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is released.

APPENDIX A: PUBLICITY OF SCOPING PERIOD

WSF advertised the SEPA scoping period through a variety of media. All materials advertised the scoping period, methods for submitting comments, and the public open house.

- Postcard: A total of 4,008 postcards were distributed to the residents of the Town of Coupeville via saturation mailing to the 98239 zip code. Also included in this mailing were 320 interested contacts from the voluntary project mailing list, which includes residents throughout Whidbey Island, Port Townsend, and outlying areas.

- Display Ads: Full-page display advertisements ran on March 15, 2006, in the *Peninsula Daily News, Whidbey News Times, South Whidbey Record* and *Port Townsend Leader*, and on March 17, 2006 in the *Coupeville Examiner.* Smaller "meeting reminder" display advertisements ran on March 22, 2006 in the *Peninsula Daily News, Whidbey News-Times, South Whidbey Record* and *Port Townsend Leader,* and on March 24, 2006 in the *Coupeville Examiner*.

- Press Release: A press release was distributed to the *Port Townsend Leader*, *Peninsula Daily News*, *Coupeville Examiner*, *Whidbey News Times*, and *South Whidbey Record*.

- Email Announcement: An email was distributed to 265 contacts from the Port Townsend/Keystone database. Keystone and Port Townsend Ferry Advisory Committee members also received this notification.

- "Route Alert" emails were sent to subscribers of the Port Townsend/Keystone route alerts.

- Project website: Project information was posted on the project's Web page, including open house details and materials. The Website is: http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/ferries/projects/KeystoneHarbor.

- Posters: Posters were placed in the Port Townsend and Keystone terminals and on vessels on the route.

- Legal notice: A legal notice was placed in the *Whidbey News Times*

- Letter: A letter was sent to applicable SEPA agency and tribal representatives from Michelle Elling, WSF Environmental Coordinator, as notification for the agency scoping meeting held April 6, 2006.

APPENDIX B: METHODS TO GATHER PUBLIC COMMENT

WSF offered several avenues for public comment on the Keystone Project. These included:

- Email: Comments could be sent to keystoneproject@wsdot.wa.gov.
- Mail: Comments could be mailed to Washington State Ferries; Attn: Hadley Greene; Customer and Community Relations; 2901 3rd Ave, Suite 500; Seattle, WA 98121-1042.
- Phone: Comments could be directed to Hadley Greene, WSF, (206) 515-3913 or Michelle Elling, WSF, at (206) 515-3578.
- Comment form: During the open house, attendees could write and leave their comments in provided boxes, or mail a comment form back to WSF. The comment form included the following questions:
    - *WSF will study a number of factors during the environmental impact statement (EIS) process, such as fish and aquatic resources, traffic, land use and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?*
    - *WSF has identified four preliminary alternatives to study in an EIS. What do you think of these alternatives? Are there other alternatives WSF should consider?*
    - *Please comment on the purpose and need for this project:*
    - *Additional Comments:*
    - *Would you like to be added to the project mailing list?*
- Court Reporter: A court reporter was present at the public open house to record oral comments.
- Flip charts: Flip charts were available at the public open house to record comments.
- Community Briefings: WSF met with several community groups in the Keystone area to brief them on the project and gather their scoping comments. WSF met with the following organizations and have included their comments as part of the scoping record:
    - Island County Commissioners
    - Ebey's Landing National Historic Reserve Trust Board
    - Island County Marine Resource Committee
    - Washington Scuba Alliance

- Whidbey Environmental Action Network (WEAN)

APPENDIX C: PUBLIC SCOPING OPEN HOUSE

WSF held an open house on Wednesday, March 29, 2006, from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m., at Coupeville Elementary School in Coupeville, WA. This meeting introduced the public to the proposed preliminary alternatives for Keystone and asked for comment on the alternatives and the purpose and need for the project. Members of the public were invited to view display boards, ask questions of project staff, and give their written and oral comments during the open house. A total of 40 members of the public attended the open house.

Display boards offered the following information:

- What is the SEPA process?
- Why is the Keystone Project needed? – The Steel Electric Vessels are Aging and Need to be Replaced
- Why is the Keystone Project needed? – Growth is expected on the Keystone-Port Townsend Route
- Why is the Keystone Project needed? – Aging Terminal Structures Need Preservation Work
- Why is the Keystone Project needed? – Operational Reliability Needs to be Improved
- Project History & Timeline
- What is WSF considering for Keystone?
- Preliminary Alternative A
- Preliminary Alternative B
- Preliminary Alternative C
- Preliminary Alternative D
- No Action Alternative
- What else has WSF considered for Keystone?
- What environmental issues should be considered in the EIS?
- What other alternatives were considered?
- What are the potential benefits of the project?
- What environmental factors will be studied?
- What's happening at Port Townsend?
- Stay involved!

Attendees were offered copies of the display boards as 8 ½ by 11-inch handouts, as well as project informational folios, a fact sheet on the SEPA environmental process, Keystone Harbor Study Executive Summaries, and comment forms.

APPENDIX D: Verbatim Public Comments

06ScopingID:	Organization:	Comment Date:	Comment Categories:
1	N/A	3/28/2006	Alternative C: Propulsion System Vessel Alternative D: Keystone Special Vessel Transportation Design & Construction Frequency/Schedule Type of Vessel

Comment Source:
Public Meeting – Comment Form

What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Using the existing harbor (C and D options) causes the least impact.

Are there other alternative WSF should consider?

Both option C and D involve the use of smaller boats which will preserve the existing schedule. The larger boat option means a lot of money spent on the Port Townsend dock and the Keystone landing, dock and breakwater, and a reduction in service until 2020 when a second boat will be added. The car service would be the same but the walk on convenience would be cut by 1/2.

Please comment on the purpose and need for this project:

New boats could be designed with better control and propulsion systems to cut down on the closures.

Comment:

The larger boat option would gain support if the schedule improved or ran later!

06ScopingID:	Organization:	Comment Date:	Comment Categories:
2	Coupeville School District	3/28/2006	Air Quality Local Traffic Coordination w/Other Area Projects EA/EIS Improve Public Safety Increased Number of Vehicles Pedestrian/Bicycle

Comment Source:
Public Meeting – Court Reporter

Comment:

[COMMENT GIVEN TO COURT REPORTER]
I have to talk to Hadley (phonetic) about getting a transcript of this, too, because I'm going to take it to my School Board. I represent the school district and-- Loosely represent the school district. I'm the Construction Manager for the new high school that we're building down here in back of the current high school at the corner of Main and Terry. Over the last 16 months and through using traffic study and just empirically evidencing what is going on, I'm convinced that we have an exceedingly dangerous situation of bringing traffic through the middle of a campus.

The high school property is broken into two pieces at the corner of Terry and Main. On the west side we have our gymnasium. And we are doing construction, adding classrooms on that side, as well. On the east side we have the high school and middle school. Both middle school and high school students go across for PE and will be going across for health classes, for extracurricular activities, etcetera, constituting hundreds of crossings each day of the street. Currently, they walk up to the corner and cross at the crosswalk there. And we have had several incidences - incidences of close encounters between automobiles and students. No one has been, that I know of, seriously injured; but my concern is that it's just a matter of time.

Of particular concern is the large trucks that come through, who come rolling into town at a 50 mile-an-hour speed and then in a period of about a block try to slow up before they get to the high school. The traffic ostensibly chokes the main intersection there where everybody has to stop. It's a four-way stop. It creates a lot of noise that affects the learning climate inside the classrooms, particularly from the trucks. There are no sidewalks on South Main. So the students are literally walking alongside the road with a - a deep ditch. So there is no way for them to get out of the way of traffic. They're forced to share the lanes with this traffic that's coming in. The-- There's an issue, also, with pollution from the vehicles being - coming right alongside our play fields and our front courtyard.

And the Coupeville School District, I am their Construction Manager, and they've spent many thousand dollars to mitigate these effects by traffic calming, creating an island of refuge so the kids can walk halfway across and be protected. And

what we would like to do is we would like to see the Washington State Ferry system, under their Environmental Impact Statement, address the issues of pollution, traffic, noise, and other effects on the school. We would suggest that they consider rerouting of the traffic by having a lane that requires that all vehicles coming off of the ferry must make a right instead of a left and travel away from the school district and the heart of Coupeville. We would like to see them look at signalization for our main corner there, which is a four-way stop currently at Terry and Main Streets. We would like to have them take a look at traffic calming through perhaps such-- Well, there's a number of things they can do, like roundabouts where the cars are forced to slow down just to go around this, if they are going to continue to take traffic through town. Or they could simply defray costs the school district has already incurred on our local bond to help with the situation as it currently exists. And that is the extent of my comment.

06ScopingID:	Organization:	Comment Date:	Comment Categories:
3	N/A	3/28/2006	Alternative A: Jetty 300' East Alternative B: Jetty Extended Design & Construction

Comment Source:
Public Meeting – Court Reporter

Comment:

[COMMENT GIVEN TO COURT REPORTER]
I want to suggest that they make a shear wall on the - whatever side that would be (indicating) - that's the west side, I believe, of the existing strip. Move the breakwater 300 feet to the east. Center the loading dock or ramp, whatever they call it, in the middle of that area so the ferry can come in with sufficient room around it if it's done there. And did I say move the breakwater or just move-- Yeah. Move the breakwater 300 feet east and extend it, if they have to, another several hundred feet that will allow safe passage of ferry into the slip. No. Unless you can figure a way to have more trust in our government entities. Which nobody seems to be able to do.

06ScopingID:	Organization:	Comment Date:	Comment Categories:
4	N/A	3/28/2006	Land Use Local Traffic Marine Waterways No Action Transportation Additional Option for Keystone Funding/Costs Geology & Soils Improve Public Safety Increased Number of Vehicles

Comment Source:
Public Meeting – Court Reporter

Comment:

[COMMENT GIVEN TO COURT REPORTER]
Well, let's see here. I got my notes. I might not necessarily say these in the proper order, but I kind of quickly wrote them down. I should have brought my reading glasses, by the way. Well, in the literature I've already received through the paper and the mail it appears that there are -- What is it? -- am I correct, three options that they're considering? I think it is. Yeah. Maybe four. And they also in one brief line stated there was one other option, kind of, and that was "No action." And as far as I'm concerned, of these options, at the moment that might be the best alternative because these - all these options that they have, I'm concerned that some of the big issues will not be able to be addressed in these major options that they're considering, of which are the environmental aspects of it, continued dredging, and along with that continued big expense because dredging is quite expensive. And, also, no matter how you do it, where you do it, where you dump it, there's the environmental impacts of it.

Another aspect of the options they're considering - major options they're considering are the limited parking that would be available in the area they're considering. The traffic flow, which more and more is going right through Coupeville instead of on the highway where it really should be. And the reason why that subtopic of the traffic is that they go by a college campus, high school and elementary school, summer camp, all of which have a lot of kids right near the road, Engle Road. And sooner or later something bad is going to happen as a result of that. And it doesn't appear that-- They've talked in the past about trying to divert the traffic to go the highway, but that doesn't look likely that they'll ever

be able to divert all of them.

And the safety issue along that was just a big, big concern of mine. Because I've lived here almost all my life, since 1962, and I cannot count how many vehicles I've seen run the stop sign at Terry Road and Main Street on their way to the ferry. I've witnessed I can't imagine how many since I was in kindergarten - in first grade 'til now. Quite a few. And just-- That's just in the brief period of time that I've happened to have been standing there. So I'm quite certain that the mathematical equations would suggest that there is a lot more than what I saw.

The other - or another concern with that is the relocating to another possible spot, which at one time a property just south of Admiral's Cove was considered briefly, but that appeared to have went by the wayside relatively quickly just because of the huge initial cost. But that would tie in well with the transit system, the highway system, eliminate a lot of traffic concerns, eliminate traffic safety concerns, I should say. Eliminate a lot of dredging. It would have room for expansion in the future. Just all the-- I suppose there are some negatives of that site, also; but there's negatives of every site. The Keystone area was just something the ferry system took over from another company a long time ago and it was kind of a bad place to start out with. And I just don't think it's the right idea to keep dumping good money into a bad idea is what, of course, is my opinion.

I'm sure there are other opinions on this. My opinion is not based on anything other than the information that's been put before me by the committees and the ferry system, been on the news, newspapers, newsletters. That is what I base my information on. And I sincerely hope that the ultimate - the people making the ultimate decision will base it on a lot of these factors of safety, long-term costs and environmental issues and it's not based on political decisions, decisions by people who are not well enough educated on the whole problem and issues that are involved in this. I'm just very concerned about the political side of this determining the way it's going to go.

Let's see if I can see my other notes here. Oh, it's getting tough to read… I think that's pretty much everything. Okay. In conclusion, I know I may not be totally educated on all the facts concerning this issue, but I try to look at it as a common sense issue as much as I can, which sometimes in the bureaucracy looking at things through common sense appears to be a little more difficult. So I hope that common sense issues are sincerely taken a look at in this issue and that I - I hope the persons operating the ferries in these conditions have a large say on where it should go as much as any of the political people involved in this. Okay.

I do realize that money concerns are a big, big part of this. Where that is likely to be a big determining factor in this - what the - the least or one of the lower cost options. But I hope it's looked at in a more long-term thing, what the costs are, than short-term affordability. Thank you.

The other reason why I think another option would be good is because then the smaller ferries could be eliminated. And, as talked about by the ferry system, then pretty much any ferry could operate at any terminal if this new one were designed properly. Which, there again, is a long-term savings of having every ferry in the fleet to be able to operate at pretty much every terminal. That probably would be a very long-term savings, also, than having a lot of different ferries. Thank you.

As I spoke about earlier about the property that is located just south of Admiral's Cove that was considered at one time, I would hope that either the ferry system or the Department of Transportation, in a long-term vision, can at least work on getting the first option to purchase that property, tie that up so that way, if needed someday in the future, that might be a possibility. Because I know planning for the future is a big part of making things better. And I know, of course, planning for the future is very difficult.

06ScopingID:	**Organization:**	**Comment Date:**	**Comment Categories:**
5	N/A	3/28/2006	Local Traffic Frequency/Schedule Vehicle Holding

Comment Source:
Public Meeting – Court Reporter

Comment:
[COMMENT GIVEN TO COURT REPORTER]
What I do is I go over to - to Port Townsend because I have a son that's a ranger in Sequim. He's a State park ranger at Sequim Bay. And so we go over there fairly often. And for the last couple of years, this time of year, it seems like every time we come back we just miss the ferry because it's so loaded that the parking lot's overflowing out into the street. And the ticket takers that - for the, you know, that take the - take your money to go on the ferry always seem to have the

opinion -- And I agree with them -- that they don't understand why they don't run two ferries, like we do in the summertime, for a longer period of time. Because it's really starting to be a back-up over at the Port Townsend end more so than over here. And I found that to be true.

And so I think if they at this time of year would run the ferries-- They could run two ferries, but run them once an hour. So that one sits over there, you know, so it's not burning fuel going across; but it's sitting there waiting for its next depart, you know, time. That that would solve a lot of that problem because then they'd be running a half hour sooner. Now you wait an hour-and-a-half if you miss the ferry. That way you'd only be waiting an hour. But you'd still be running two ferries. I think there's enough people to justify running two ferries year round. Granted, there's the problem when they come in here. But that's - that's eventually going to be fixed. So that's my comment. Tom Graham. Thank you.

06ScopingID:	**Organization:**	**Comment Date:**	**Comment Categories:**
6	N/A	3/28/2006	Alternative A: Jetty 300' East Alternative B: Jetty Extended Alternative C: Propulsion System Vessel Frequency/Schedule Funding/Costs Pedestrian/Bicycle Type of Vessel

Comment Source:
Public Meeting – Court Reporter

Comment:
[COMMENT GIVEN TO COURT REPORTER]
I would-- I'm more in favor of the Option C because of the Option C included a hundred passenger ferry that there would be two running, which would continue the walk-on service as it is and improve the car service, which is what we need, as opposed to A or B, which one boat until Year 2020, if I'll still even be here by then. And one - one boat every hour-and-a-half really decreases the service in terms of walk-on, which is what most Whidbey islanders do. We don't tend to take the car across. So this whole item seemed kind of odd to be spending so much money to decrease the service.

Now, if they were planning on running two of the large boats with that other option, Option A or B, and the service is actually going to improve for the summer runs, then I could see that it would be probably a reasonable situation. But I'm not sure that's what they have in mind because I asked them and they said no. And so I think my strong urgings would be to run the Option C with a hundred-car ferry and regular winter service, regular summer service just like it is now using the existing harbor. Okay.

06ScopingID:	**Organization:**	**Comment Date:**	**Comment Categories:**
7	N/A	3/28/2006	Local Traffic Coordination w/ Other Area Projects Energy

Comment Source:
Public Meeting – Court Reporter

Comment:
[COMMENT GIVEN TO COURT REP0RTER]

Albert R. Bowers. 705 Northeast Sixth Street in Coupeville. And I want to see a sign installed where you come off the ferry that says, "Coupeville via County road: 4 mile" or whatever it is, 4 to 5-miles. "Coupeville via State Highway: 12 miles and 90-degree curve." I picture your sign looking at just the sign which says "Coupeville" with an arrow, "4 miles, County road." The other one is an arrow going the other way. It would be nice if you could draw the thing, 12-mile. They talk about saving fuel and everything. That's ridiculous. The County road is just as good and better than the State highway. Partway down that spit there's a 90-degree curve. And you build up speed. When you get to the end of that straightaway, there's a ten-foot bog or deeper. So anyone who misses that curve, ends up in that muck hole. Terrible. But it's a dead 90-degree turn. So I'd like to see them put a sign up there that says, "Coupeville to the left, 4 miles." Or "County Seat," something like that, Coupeville." And the other one "12 miles." Thank you. You know, it don't make sense. They talk about saving fuel and everything else, yet they do this garbage of sending them 12 miles. Don't make sense to me.

06ScopingID:	Organization:	Comment Date:	Comment Categories:
8	N/A	3/28/2006	Historic, Cultural, Archeological Visual Quality Design & Construction

Comment Source:
Public Meeting – Court Reporter

Comment:
[COMMENT GIVEN TO COURT REPORTER]
The current terminal is ugly. I think we can do better designing it to be more pleasing to the - to the eye. And particularly considering the location there, you know, to make it look better. I hate those old creosote timbers, you know, poking up to the sky. I don't know if that's replacing. Maybe just putting up the same. I don't know. That's it.

06ScopingID:	Organization:	Comment Date:	Comment Categories:
9	N/A	3/28/2006	Visual Quality

Comment Source:
Public Meeting – Comment Form

Comment:
The present terminal is ugly. We can do better and should be part of the new design.

06ScopingID:	Organization:	Comment Date:	Comment Categories:
10	N/A	3/28/2006	

Comment Source:
Public Meeting – Comment form

Comment:
It (referring to one of the alternatives, not specifying which one) seems to make a lot of sense and I feel it is the best choice.

06ScopingID:	Organization:	Comment Date:	Comment Categories:
11	Island County Marine Resource Committee	3/15/2006	Air Quality Alternative A: Jetty 300' East Alternative B: Jetty Extended Alternative C: Propulsion System Vessel Alternative D: Keystone Special Vessel Economics Environmental Justice Fisheries Geology & Soils Historic, Cultural, Archeological Land Use Local Traffic Marine Waterways Parks & Recreation Social

Comment Source:
Community Briefing

Wildlife & Vegetation
WSF Policy Decision
Crockett Lake
Displacements/Property Acquisition
EA/EIS
Ebey's Landing Historic Reserve
Endangered Species
Funding/Costs
Hazardous Materials
Hydraulics (e.g. Beach Erosion)
Hydrology
Noise & Vibration
Participating Agencies
Proximity to SR 20/525
Purpose & Need
Type of Vessel
Vehicle Ingress/Egress/Turnaround
Water Quality
Way of Life
Wetlands

Comment:

What about the option that included a steel pile wall on west side of harbor? Why isn't that being considered in the EIS?

Did WSF believe it was a hazard to put a sheet pile wall along the edge of the harbor?

Would the State Park campground be relocated? Would the entire campground be impacted? How many campsites would be removed?

WSF needs a new vessel for all of the options – it just depends if it's one that works for the rest of the fleet or if it is a unique vessel that would only be used in Keystone. Is this true?

Alternatives C & D are a choice of vessels – is it a choice of cost between vessels (i.e. does one cost more than the other?), or are you considering other factors?

WSF needs a new vessel for all of the options – it just depends if it's one that works for the rest of the fleet or if it is a unique vessel that would only be used in Keystone. Is this true?

Do any of these options affect the Port Townsend project? Do they all work with the design for Port Townsend? Does the Port Townsend project have a preferred vessel?

Do you need a larger holding area for a larger boat?

In the economic analysis are you considering the impact of the larger ferry on the costs of the Port Townsend project (i.e. dredging)?

Is there any change planned for the signage at the Keystone Terminal exit? Right now it mis-directs drivers the long way around.

Keystone Harbor is used extensively by juvenile salmonids. Is the team aware of recent work done by Washington Trout? Those studies should be referenced in the EIS.

The MRC has talked extensively about impacts to the Conservation Area and is also concerned about impacts to the dive park.

Look at the impact of extending the jetty on communities and organisms that live along or near it.

How will the project impact diving along the jetty?

WSF seems more concerned with environmental impacts than engineering and economics. Alternatives A and B have greater environmental impacts, so they obviously would be eliminated if this were the only criteria. Is WSF also going to consider costs and other factors?

The EIS is not the correct vehicle to make this decision because you are mixing engineering and economic questions with environmental impacts. There is no way to make a decision with this process.

Even though WSF seems to have already decided on a vessel, the small boats seem to be the best choice.

Make it clear that Alternative A includes dredging and widening harbor.

There was an extensive process to make this a marine protected area and Conservation Area. Moving the jetty has impacts to the Conservation Area that should be considered. It's not enough to just move the Conservation Area farther down the spit.

This group is concerned over impacts to species on the jetty and piling.

06ScopingID:	**Organization:**	**Comment Date:**	**Comment Categories:**
12	Island County Marine Resources Committee	3/27/2006	WSF Policy Decision Economics Funding/Costs Out of Harbor Alternative

Comment Source:
Email

Comment:
I am against wasting taxpayer money by leaving the terminal in Keystone Harbor. It is so obvious that it should be relocated on the Keystone spit. Please advise if a proposal to relocate would be appropriate at the Wednesday eve Coupeville meeting. I realize that it is a scoping meeting for environmental concerns. Also, would it do any good to organize and get more support for relocation? Considering the strong environmental concerns and the homeowners, in the area, it would probably be a losing battle. Also, I doubt if I could ever sway Mary Margaret. She listens to her constituents who make the most noise.

06ScopingID:	**Organization:**	**Comment Date:**	**Comment Categories:**
13	N/A	3/21/2006	Alternative B: Jetty Extended Local Traffic WSF Policy Decision EA/EIS Frequency/Schedule Increased Number of Vehicles Type of Vessel Vehicle Holding Vehicle Ingress/Egress/Turnaround

Comment Source:
Email

Comment:
Hello, my name is David McCloskey and I am a retired Navy chief petty officer, currently working for Lockheed Martin at the Bangor submarine base. I own a home in Oak Harbor and work at Bangor Monday through Friday. I use the Keystone and Port Townsend ferry every weekend to go home for the last three years as a geo-bachelor. Lately, I have been very dissatisfied with the service and need to voice my opinion on how to correct the problems.

1. The Thanksgiving holiday should of had two boats on Wednesday when it was the biggest traveling day Instead of running a Saturday schedule for Thursday. (I sat two hours waiting).

2. This Holland Happening season (I waited for three hours) at the Keystone landing, as there was only one boat and the two boat season starts two weeks later. We need two boats for this weekend as there are also soccer tournaments going on over here and bogging up traffic.

3. We need a bigger boat such as the Evergreen State class. 3 feet more draft, yet it can carry 25 more vehicles. Some say the problem is the -4 tides, it is also the winds that push these diesel electrics and have caused 45 minute delays. The U.S Army Corps of Engineers have an ARMORED CONCRETE UNIT called CORE-LOCK, which was used for the jetty system in Humboldt Bay / Eureka, CA. These would surely help to expand the jetty out another 300-600 feet required.

4. There is no walk on parking area for the Port Townsend run. Every parking lot there is posted as a tow away zone.

5. Why is the environmental impact study scheduled for 2008? We need a fix soon. Example was when I witnessed the Quinault run aground last summer.

Wished I could be at your meeting. But the country depends on me to do my job. Thank you for your time.

06ScopingID: 14

Organization: N/A

Comment Date: 3/20/2006

Comment Source: Email

Comment Categories:
Alternative C: Propulsion System Vessel
Alternative D: Keystone Special Vessel
No Action
Parks & Recreation
Transportation
Wildlife & Vegetation
Displacements/Property Acquisition
Ebey's Landing Historic Reserve
Type of Vessel

Comment:
My husband and I are residents of Coupeville. We are both scuba divers and one of the main attractions for moving here was the Keystone Jetty Dive Site. We are very concerned about this wonderful dive site being destroyed by relocating the jetty. The underwater animal and plant life is incredible there and would take years to regenerate. The Keystone Jetty Dive Site is renowned as one of the top dive sites in the Puget Sound area. Divers frequently come from Oregon, Eastern Washington and Canada and are a great boost to our local economy. The Keystone Ferry route is not one that is frequented by commuters (like Mukilteo) so cancellations due to weather and low tides should not be a critical issue. My proposal would be to use the existing harbor and terminal, and to either take no action or acquire new vessels that are similar in size to the existing vessels.

06ScopingID: 15

Organization: Port Townsend Chamber of Commerce

Comment Date: 3/29/2006

Comment Source: Email

Comment Categories:
Economics
Historic, Cultural, Archeological
Local Traffic
Parks & Recreation
Transportation
Coordination w/ Other Area Projects
Increased Number of Vehicles
Transit
Vehicle Holding
Vehicle Ingress/Egress/Turnaround

Comment:
I'm sorry I was unable to make it over to Whidbey Island for the public open house. However, on behalf of the Port Townsend Chamber of Commerce, we would like to add our recommendations to the Keystone Terminal Project:

1. We strongly believe there is a need for adequate day-use, and overnight parking at, or adjacent to, the terminal site.
2. We strongly believe there is a need for a visitor information center at, or adjacent to, the terminal site.
3. We strongly believe there is a need for an Island Transit passenger transfer station, at or adjacent to, the terminal site.

We believe the above facilities, and infrastructure services will greatly increase accessibility to alternative transportation for the growing commuter population using this route, as well as the already significant tourism market this route experiences.

The Port Townsend Chamber of Commerce is willing to "put its money where its mouth is," regarding the visitor information center. We believe there is great potential in providing visitors information on how to enjoy the Olympic Peninsula without their vehicles through greater understanding and use of our transit system connections.

Keystone would serve as an excellent jumping off point to the Peninsula, and Port Townsend would reciprocate to Island, and San Juan counties.

If there are any questions regarding the above recommendations, please contact us at your convenience.

06ScopingID:	Organization:	Comment Date:	Comment Categories:
16	N/A	3/29/2006	Transportation Frequency/Schedule Increased Number of Vehicles Purpose & Need Vehicle Holding

Comment Source:
Email

Comment:

I was at your meeting in Coupeville on Tuesday and I believe that someone from WSF said that the latest forecast of the growth of ridership on the various ferry routes had just been completed. I was hoping to take a look at it but could not find it on the website (which by the way is great). Maybe I am just lost? Can you help - thanks!

06ScopingID:	Organization:	Comment Date:	Comment Categories:
17	N/A	4/5/2006	Local Traffic Transportation Wildlife & Vegetation WSF Policy Decision Economics Frequency/Schedule Increased Number of Vehicles Pedestrian/Bicycle Transit Type of Vessel

Comment Source:
Email

Comment:

Greetings,
I am a resident of Port Townsend and I use the Keystone ferry. I have been following your planning process with great interest. I believe that it is important to standardize your fleet when you retire the old class of ferries. My biggest concerns are the following for both the Port Townsend and Whidbey Island communities:

1. Ensure that the expansion of facilities that is necessary for new vessels does not adversely affect the environment - particularly eel grass beds.
2. Maximize walk on ferry traffic to lessen the impact of auto traffic. This means keeping the ferry dock in the heart of Port Townsend and not moving it further south. It also means providing much better bus and shuttle access on both sides of the ferry run but particularly on the Whidbey side. Any other mechanisms you can use to maximize walk on and bike use of the ferry would be greatly appreciated.
3. Maximize ferry safety and predictable schedules. Again I believe this can be accomplished by standardizing the fleet.

Thanks for your hard work on this important transportation link for our two communities. I look forward to a more efficient, dependable, and commodious ferry service in the future

---

06ScopingID:
18

Organization:
Whidbey Environmental Action Network

Comment Date:
3/22/2006

Comment Source:
Community Briefing

Comment Categories:
Air Quality
Alternative A: Jetty 300' East
Alternative B: Jetty Extended
Alternative C: Propulsion System Vessel
Alternative D: Keystone Special Vessel
Energy
Fisheries
Geology & Soils
Hazardous Materials
Land Use
No Action
Parks & Recreation
Water Resources
Wildlife & Vegetation
Crockett Lake
Funding/Costs
Hydrology
Type of Vessel
Vehicle Ingress/Egress/Turnaround

Comment:
Where will the dredge material be deposited? Will it be clean material?

The EIS should show the fuel efficiency and air emissions of all three vessels under consideration. An accurate calculation will require knowing the exact deployment (number, type) of the vessels under consideration.

What technique will be used to remove creosote pilings? WSF should look into a technique developed by Tony Frantz.

What mitigation is proposed for the increased impervious surface area?

Could pervious pavement be used rather than impervious pavement for the holding area?

There will be loss of habitat on Keystone Spit if the park campground is relocated there (Alternative B).

The most valuable environmental resource in the project area appears to be the Keystone Conservation Area.

What impacts will there be to organisms in the dive park? What mitigation is proposed?

The addition of a fish passage through the jetty in Alternative A is very appealing.

WSF should talk to Ron Thom at Battelle regarding a re-colonization plan for the jetty.

Crockett Lake provides a nursery for salmon—WEAN is concerned about impacts to the lake with any alternative.

Alternatives C and D appear to have the least environmental impacts.

Do not disregard a low impact alternative simply because of higher costs.

Are the figures for the current holding area capacity accurate?

How much dredging will be required for each of the alternatives?

The analysis should include sending someone over to Finland/Sweden/Norway/Australia to see the alternative vessels (Alternatives C and D). WSF captains need to be comfortable with the new boat options in order to make a choice.

What is the advantage of building new Steel Electric-type boats? Wouldn't these vessels have the same problems (cancellations, navigation, etc.) that the existing boats have?

Include a sensitivity test regarding the impact of rising fuel costs on ridership numbers.

06ScopingID:	Organization:	Comment Date:	Comment Categories:
19	N/A	4/18/2006	Alternative B: Jetty Extended Alternative C: Propulsion System Vessel Alternative D: Keystone Special Vessel Economics Energy Historic, Cultural, Archeological Local Traffic Parks & Recreation Wildlife & Vegetation Ebey's Landing Historic Reserve Frequency/Schedule Funding/Costs Historic, Cultural, & Archeological Increased Number of Vehicles Tariffs Type of Vessel Vehicle Ingress/Egress/Turnaround

Comment Source:
Email

Comment:
Dear Mr. Greene,
For reasons we shall enumerate we have calculated that the employment of smaller more maneuverable vessels would be the best choice for the Keystone- Port Townsend ferry. Our reasons are:

The projected ridership is based solely on population growth and does not take into account changing behavioral patterns. We already have seen a reduction in ridership. Increases fuel and ferry prices are sure to escalate not be reduced in future.

Modification of the present pocket port at keystone will impact the historic truth of this place, which is a historic reserve. The building of a 600-foot jetty would also adversely effect the marine environment by causing a 6-acre footprint new to the bottom of the Sound. The marine park would for a while also change.

The proposed 600-foot jetty could seriously impact the viability of juvenile salmon that would be pushed into deeper water where they would be subject to increased predation.

Smaller vessels actually allow more flexibility by allowing for the unknown factor of when and if ridership changes. Committing to the larger vessels is unwise in light of this very significant unknown. Larger vessels would mean less frequent sailings every 90 minutes which would cause greater holding areas on both sides as well as large boluses of traffic due to the larger number of car disgorged.

We favor the acquisition of new smaller vessels with the new, highly maneuverable propulsion systems available today. Such a system would result in grater ease of operation coming into Keystone and more reliable service. Thank you for responding to these concerns.

06ScopingID: 20

Organization: N/A

Comment Date: 4/13/2006

Comment Source: Email

Comment Categories:
Alternative A: Jetty 300' East
Alternative B: Jetty Extended
Wildlife & Vegetation
Parks & Recreation
Social
Type of Vessel
Way of Life

Comment:

As a relatively frequent rider of the keystone ferry and very active scuba diver, from my limited knowledge I would strongly support any plan that allows for a larger, safer ferry in order to accommodate the growth in the population. However, I am also very concerned about the impact to the underwater life that currently resides in the area. This jetty supports an abundance of life. It is a draw from all around the state as an attraction and true natural wonder for other divers. It has been ranked in a national magazine as one of the great shore dives of Washington State. While, much of the life might survive a move or replenish itself in time, I feel it is important to recognize that by physically moving the jetty we would be causing a major disruption to the underwater environment. While many people are unaware of the amount of activity that is occurring under the waters surface, I would hate to see this aspect of the planning be ignored. The jetty is a jewel that we would treasure and work to sustain.

Keeping with these thoughts I would, if it can be done in a manner with limited impact, be in full support of extending the jetty as proposed in option B. This could make for an even nicer habitat and continue to draw visitors to our part of the state. I am proud to live and dive in the area. I like to actively to my part to clean up the area under the water to maintain the habitat of the resident marine animals. This is a location I never get tired of diving at because of the abundance of life. I am in full support of a plan that could accommodate for growth above and below the waters surface.

06ScopingID: 21

Organization: National Park Service

Comment Date: 4/6/2006

Comment Source: Public Meeting – Agency Scoping

Comment Categories:
Alternative A: Jetty 300' East
Alternative B: Jetty Extended
Historic, Cultural, Archeological
Local Traffic
Parks & Recreation
Ebey's Landing Historic Reserve
Increased Number of Vehicles
Out of Harbor Alternative
Parks & Recreation
Type of Vessel
Vehicle Holding
Vehicle Ingress/Egress/Turnaround

Comment:

1. Would there be any impacts of a relocated or extended jetty (Alternatives A or B) to the historic wharf along the east side of the Conservation Area? Possibly heavier waves or currents, sediment deposition?
2. WSF should investigate the possibility that the Steel Electric vessels are eligible for the National Register. There is a need to go through the process of determining that eligibility.
3. There is a need to consider indirect impacts on national historic areas in the vicinity of the project. The historic character of, and the visitor's experience at, Ebey's Landing National Historic Reserve and/or Fort Casey could be affected by additional traffic along the backroads going past farms and day parking along the highway.
4. Day parking along the highway will likely displace "small scale facilities", such as the historic sidewalk and steps that are a part of the original Fort Casey; also need to consider the indirect effects on the power plant and trails within the Fort.
5. Concern about traffic between the terminal and Coupeville that passes several schools.
6. Is WSF at risk if it does not consider the "out-of-the-harbor" option?

06ScopingID:	Organization:	Comment Date:	Comment Categories:
22	Washington State Parks	4/6/2006	Historic, Cultural, Archeological Parks & Recreation

Comment Source:
Public Meeting – Agency Scoping

Comment:
Will the public boat launch be closed during construction? This is a very popular facility and closure would cause a considerable public outcry.

06ScopingID:	Organization:	Comment Date:	Comment Categories:
23	Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife	4/6/2006	Alternative A: Jetty 300' East Alternative B: Jetty Extended Fisheries Geology & Soils Parks & Recreation Water Resources Wildlife & Vegetation Crockett Lake

Comment Source:
Public Meeting – Agency Scoping

Comment:

1. Near-shore fish passage is very important to the agency and should be considered in the design of the relocated or extended jetty (Alternatives A or B)—a "migration bench" has been suggested.
2. Would the shoreline of the harbor be hardened with either Alternative A or B? Rip-wrap is discouraged by the agency. WSF should study a shoreline that is fish-friendly with a soft bank/beach. The proposed 10:1 slopes were seen as supporting that concept.
3. Extending the jetty opens up a number (although unspecified) of new issues.
4. It is too early to eliminate Crockett Lake as a potential site for mitigation.

06ScopingID:	Organization:	Comment Date:	Comment Categories:
24	EPA	4/6/2006	Geology & Soils Hazardous Materials Water Resources

Comment Source:
Public Meeting – Agency Scoping

Comment:

1. If water disposal of dredged materials is being considered, it will be WSF's responsibility to determine precisely where the material is going and whether it is clean. EPA will want to review the findings of that testing. This will need to be done before any Corps 404 permit can be issued.
2. Would the Corps continue to dredge the harbor regardless of what alternative is selected?

06ScopingID:	Organization:	Comment Date:	Comment Categories:
25	Washington State Patrol	4/6/2006	Alternative A: Jetty 300' East Alternative B: Jetty Extended Local Traffic Transportation Utilities/Public Services Improve Public Safety Vehicle Ingress/Egress/Turnaround

Comment Source:
Public Meeting – Agency Scoping

Comment:

1. Keystone Terminal could be a choke point for getting equipment and supplies to Whidbey Island, or evacuating people off the island, during an emergency/terrorist attack. If Deception Pass Bridge is unavailable, or the Mukilteo-Clinton ferry is not operable, Keystone is the only facility to accommodate critical services (fire, etc.). The capacity of the terminal needs to be able to accommodate the largest vessel available in the WSF fleet, or other large vessels.

06ScopingID:	Organization:	Comment Date:	Comment Categories:
26	Army Corps of Engineers	4/6/2006	Historic, Cultural, Archeological Parks & Recreation Water Resources EA/EIS Ebey's Landing Historic Reserve Hydraulics (e.g. Beach Erosion) Out of Harbor Alternative

Comment Source:
Public Meeting – Agency Scoping

Comment:

1. The Corps anticipates that a NEPA EA will be prepared to support a standard individual permit.
2. In support of their action, the Corps will want to know about the history of the site; 10-year photos since the 1940s will be very helpful. Information about the jetty, littoral drift, and currents will be valuable.
3. The Corps will rely on the NEPA documentation. In order to arrive at a reasonable decision within the NEPA process, there will need to be an examination of a reasonable range of alternatives. The Corps may ask WSF to consider an "out-of-the-harbor" option to meet NEPA requirements. That request may come toward the end of the review process, resulting in delays to the project.

06ScopingID:	Organization:	Comment Date:	Comment Categories:
27	Port of Port Townsend	4/6/2006	Alternative A: Jetty 300' East Alternative B: Jetty Extended Alternative C: Propulsion System Vessel Alternative D: Keystone Special Vessel Local Traffic WSF Policy Decision Increased Number of Vehicles Type of Vessel

Comment Source:
Public Meeting – Agency Scoping

Comment:

1. The preferred alternative should allow for the largest vessel—a smaller vessel option is shortsighted.
2. Moving the jetty is the most viable option.
3. Mitigation opportunities are plentiful.
4. Secondary impacts of increased traffic on local roads—the project will result in the need to widen several roads in the area—this issue should be studied.
5. We do a disservice to the public if we allow special interests to dictate the range of alternatives—if there are better options, we should study them.

06ScopingID:	Organization:	Comment Date:	Comment Categories:
28	Swinomish Tribe	4/6/2006	Out of Harbor Alternative EA/EIS

Comment Source:
Public Meeting – Agency Scoping

Comment:

The environmental process is being short-circuited if an "out-of-the–harbor" option is not considered. The process requires a complete, balanced analysis that weighs the impacts of both in and out of the harbor options - in-harbor options may have impacts that the out-of-the-harbor option don't and without studying that, sound environmental decisions can't be made.

06ScopingID:	Organization:	Comment Date:	Comment Categories:
29	Department of Ecology	4/6/2006	Parks & Recreation Ebey's Landing Historic Reserve Increased Number of Vehicles Local Traffic Vehicle Holding

Comment Source:
Public Meeting – Agency Scoping

Comment:

What are the likely effects to the natural area east of the boat launch - if this area is used to mitigate for the loss of parking elsewhere, what impact would occur?

06ScopingID:	Organization:	Comment Date:	Comment Categories:
30	N/A - Anonymous	4/6/2006	Fisheries Historic, Cultural, Archeological Water Resources Wildlife & Vegetation Crockett Lake Fisheries Parks & Recreation Reliability Type of Vessel

Comment Source:
Public Meeting – Agency Scoping

Comment:

1. Despite the fact that the project may not affect Crockett Lake, WSF should consider some "good neighbor" enhancements. The lake has great potential as a nursery point for numerous species, and there would be huge potential benefits if WSF considered that in the design of the project.
2. What are the advantages of staying in the harbor vs. going outside the harbor? Is one or the other safer or more efficient; would cancellations be reduced; would there be new impacts because of a new location; could the existing harbor be restored?

06ScopingID:	Organization:	Comment Date:	Comment Categories:
31	Island County Marine Resource Committee	4/24/2006	Alternative A: Jetty 300' East Alternative B: Jetty Extended Alternative C: Propulsion System Vessel Alternative D: Keystone Special Vessel Economics Energy Geology & Soils Utilities/Public Services Water Resources Wildlife & Vegetation Crockett Lake Funding/Costs Hydraulics (e.g. Beach Erosion) Increased Number of Vehicles Vehicle Holding

Comment Source:
Mail

Comment:

Washington State Ferries (WSF) is moving forward with an environmental impact statement process to determine the best alternative for the Keystone end of the Keystone-Port Townsend route. The following questions and comments are respectfully submitted pursuant to the public scoping comment period provided by that process.

Island County Marine Resources Committee (MRC) advises the Island County Commissioners on matters affecting the waters and shoreline of Whidbey and Camano islands. On March 15, 2006, the WSF project manager and consultant for Keystone briefed the committee on four proposed options for improvements of the Keystone—Port Townsend ferry operations.

Two of the options (A&B) would require major modifications to Keystone Harbor. These would appear to significantly disrupt marine species and habitat in the Keystone Marine Conservation Area, as well as marine-related recreation and tourist activity of economic benefit to Island County. The MRC explored these impacts and received testimony from interested and expert sources.

The MRC believes WSF should address the following concerns and questions as part of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). These concerns focus primarily on Options A and B, which would accommodate larger vessels of the 130-vehicle-capacity (Issaquah) class.

Dredging / spoils / scouring / jetty alternation and relocation issues

1. In 1991 the Corps of Engineers estimated that 48,000 cubic yards would need to be dredged from the existing channel to avoid trip cancellation by the existing steel-electric ferries. Given the draft of the larger, standard 130-vehicle ferries, as contrasted against the existing smaller steel electrics:
   a) How much additional dredging would be required of the expanded harbor maneuvering space for Options A and B?
   b) To what degree would channel dredging frequency be changed by using newer technology vessels of shallower draft?
   c) To what degree would newer vessels with shallower draft affect the low-tide cancellations each year?
   d) Would using a shallow-draft, catamaran-design ferry allow for less dredging of Keystone Harbor and would that help offset any possible increased vessel costs?
   e) If a shallow-draft, catamaran-design ferry were used and this required less dredging of Keystone Harbor, how significant is the reduced environmental impact of the reduced dredging on Keystone Harbor itself and also on areas potentially impacted by the dredge spoils?
   f) Where are future dredge spoils planned to be deposited?
   g) Does mitigating the impacts of future dredge spoils from Keystone Harbor warrant a vessel design such as a shallow-draft catamaran?
2. What is the probable effect of such dredging on marine life?
3. What modifications would be required to accommodate the 130-vehicle capacity vessel at the Port Townsend terminal?
4. Will there be a study as to the presence of contaminated soils in areas where the dredging will be done?
5. Does the study of tidal conditions under Option A provide any information or prediction of potential changes in beach formation?
6. Would removal and export of the Fort Casey State Park camping area under Option B require armoring of the remaining shoreline (sheet piles or seawall) to protect the upland from erosion due to ferry propulsion and wind-wave action?
7. Option B widens the harbor but does not appear to lessen the impact of cross-channel tidal currents. How would the standard 130-vehicle vessel be affected by crosscurrents in Option B?
8. Have any definitive studies been done or papers published in professional journals that can predict with some

certainty the impact of changing the existing jetty configuration on the local deposit or removal of sediments in the basin area?

9. How do we know that moving or extending the existing jetty will not exacerbate the deposit of sands and sediments requiring more frequent dredging, which is so detrimental to marine life and habitat?
10. How would extending the jetty affect the natural ebb and flow of sand and bottom matter three to five miles on either side?

Marine species and habitat issues

11. What impact would each option have on the rockfish inhabiting the waters around the jetty?
12. How would each option impact the kelp beds adjacent to the jetty?
13. The giant Pacific octopus inhabits two or more den sites on the jetty. Are there studies that show how long it takes for this species to establish den areas in newly-constructed rock jetties? How will each option affect this species not only directly by removing its den sites but also its food supply?
14. Female octopuses create den sites and stay with their eggs for 5-7 months until they hatch. What measures are planned to insure there are no females with eggs in den sites on the jetty when work is done to alter it?
15. Has an inventory of species living on and around the jetty and nearby derelict structure of pilings been done? How many species of sub-tidal organisms will each option impact? Are any of those species protected, endangered or threatened?
16. At least one invertebrate species living on the jetty, Urticina crassicornis (commonly called the Christmas or painted anemone) has a life span of 60 – 80 years. Is there a plan to collect, maintain and move individuals of this long-lived species from the present jetty to a new jetty if one is built?
17. If the existing jetty were removed and a new jetty constructed 300 feet away, how would this impact the salmon and trout, both young and adult, that hug the shore on their migration routes?
18. What would be the impact on forage fish that currently use the outside of the present jetty?
19. What method would be used to relocate the present jetty to a new location? Where would the rocks come from? What would happen to the marine life on the old rocks that are the "building blocks" of the present jetty?
20. Would removed eelgrass and natural habitat be placed elsewhere?
21. Opinions vary widely on the recovery time necessary for the Underwater Marine Park in the area under study – especially for mature populations. Based on first-hand reports from divers using this resource, the jetty rivals the Edmonds underwater park as a safe haven for marine life and now serves as a fish nursery for the surrounding waters. Has a credible assessment been made as to the impact and recovery time on marine life in the affected area if one of the options includes relocation or major modification of the jetty?
22. Option A seems to involve removing the derelict structure of pilings located a short distance east of the jetty. What effect would removal of this structure have on the pigeon guillemots that nest and breed there, and on the diversity of marine life that attracts divers to the structure? How would any loss of habitat for birds or marine life be restored?
23. If the jetty were extended, how would the young and adult fish be affected/
24. Washington Trout is conducting a study of juvenile salmon on the West Whidbey nearshore, providing valuable information about the needs and behavior of juvenile salmon migrating and rearing in Puget sound and the conditions they experience in various nearshore habitats. They are finding a significant number of juvenile chum, Coho, Chinook and pink salmon at Keystone Harbor and beach. What impact will the various options for Keystone ferry landing have on this important resource?

Vessel issues

25. It has been stated that fleet uniformity and vessel interchangeability favor the use of a larger vessel on the Keystone-Port Townsend and would result in significant lifecycle cost savings. Options A and B accommodate such vessels by widening the harbor and reducing the impact of tidal currents on maneuvering and are also more capable of accommodating the anticipated future capacity increase.
   a) Would there be uniformity between the existing 130-vehicle-class and a new vessel procured for the Keystone-Port Townsend route?
   b) Could a smaller vessel procured for the Keystone-Port Townsend route also be used on other routes?
   c) Could twin hull (catamaran) type vessels with increased speed and maneuverability (special propulsion-Option D) reduce travel time and increase capacity?
26. The WSF study mentions "uncertainties about details of special propulsion vessels" and unfavorable hull characteristics in beam seas during the crossing. What hull characteristics have been considered and has the existing body of experience by operators other than WSF been reviewed? Does the WSF study consider Z-drives a "special propulsion" system in light of the fact that they are commonly used today? Would the use of fore and aft Z-drive propulsion systems on a catamaran style vessel lessen the impact on the benthic substrate of Keystone Harbor? Would the use of fore and aft Z-drive propulsion systems on a catamaran style ferry vessel make the entrance to the existing Keystone Harbor easier to manage in crossing currents?
27. The WSF study indicates that special funding for Options C and D would not be available. Why is it possible to assume funding of Options A and B but not C?
28. The monohull design of existing state ferries appears to require a deeper draft than catamaran-type designs.

The reverse thrust of existing monohull designs with large propellers appears to have a significant scouring effect on the beach, eelgrass and other marine life. Might a different hull design and propulsion system, such as a catamaran hull with 360-degree Z-Drive engines, use the existing harbor without widening or deepening, or relocating or extending the jetty, and inflict less scouring on the beach, while meeting the ferry system's goals for passenger safety?

29. Are more fuel-efficient technologies available than those used on the existing ferries that would not only conserve expensive fuel but also discharge less greenhouse and other polluting gases into the atmosphere? In other words, do the options under consideration for the Keystone project offer a possibility to actually, reduce, rather than increase, negative impacts from current levels on not only the marine resource but also the atmosphere?
30. With all the new technology available in boat building and alternative forms of propulsion, is WSF actively seeking a solution that would be sound both economically and environmentally?
31. What impact would a larger ferry have on Crockett Lake when slowing and discharging a larger body of water?
32. What are the environmental impacts of 130 cars waiting 1.5 hours for a ferry as opposed to 75 cars waiting 45 minutes for a ferry?
33. Is the septic system of the passenger waiting area at Keystone sufficient for handling the impact of 130p-car passengers waiting for 1.5 hour intervals during the busy ferry season?

Marine recreation and economy

34. What are the projected economic impact to Island county businesses and government of destroying a population and nationally known dive site?
35. Recreational boaters and anglers on the west side of Whidbey Island face a well-recognized shortage of safe boat-launching ramps providing access to the Admiralty Inlet Marine Stewardship Area and the associated fishing banks in the vicinity of Smith Island, et al. Do each of the options under consideration address the impact to the unique launch ramp at Keystone Harbor in terms of safety, economics, and environmental aspects?
36. Abrupt changes of water level in Keystone Harbor are a concern for people launching boats, children playing on the beach, and others who use the harbor. If a larger boat were use on this run, how much would the water level of the harbor rise when that boat entered the harbor?

Process issues

37. Once a state agency creates a Marine Protected Area, such as the one adjacent to Keystone Jetty, what is the process needed by government to change or eliminate that level of protection?

We appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments and thank you for your cooperation and courtesy in this process.

06ScopingID:	**Organization:**	**Comment Date:**	**Comment Categories:**
32	Whidbey Audubon Society	4/25/2006	Alternative A: Jetty 300' East Alternative B: Jetty Extended Alternative C: Propulsion System Vessel Geology & Soils Marine Waterways Parks & Recreation Wildlife & Vegetation

Comment Source:
Mail

Comment:

Whidbey Audubon Society asks that Washington State Ferries please read and consider our position regarding the proposed options regarding changes to the Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Keith Becker
Conservation Chairperson Whidbey Audubon Society

WHIDBEY AUDUBON SOCIETY POSITION REGARDING KEYSTONE FERRY CHANGES

Whidbey Audubon Society supports Washington State Ferry Option C for improving service at Keystone. While understanding that the use of larger ferries, uniform with the rest of the WSF system, presents itself and attractive choice, we at Whidbey Audubon believe that the major changes to Keystone Harbor that would be necessary under both

Option A and B and the potential devastating environmental consequences argue strongly in favor of Option C.

Option A would be particularly devastating to the Keystone Harbor area. The Keystone Conservation Area, a prime underwater dive site with an enormous diversity of fish, invertebrates, and plants that have developed over many years, would have to be destroyed. It is a unique habitat that is visited by divers from all over the United States. Currently the Reef Environmental Education Foundation surveys this area for 51 fish species and 37 invertebrate species, including blood stars, several species of limpets, various sponges, hundreds of sea anemones, some of which live 60-80 years. Standing on the beach and looking out towards Admiralty Bay, on gets no appreciation of the tremendous ecological diversity beneath those waters in the Keystone Conservation Area. To merely designate an area further east in Admiralty Bay as a dive site and believe that the same population will regenerate in a short time is highly unlikely. An eminent marine biologist predicts it will take a minimum of 10 years for anything comparable to the present rich faunal-algal complex to restore itself.

Option B will not disrupt the dive site but will also result in major unknown and unpredictable environmental changes to the Harbor area. The rock jetty will be extended 600 feet into Admiralty Bay and the jetty footprint will be expanded from one acre to five acres. Because of the deeper waters into which the jetty is extended this extension will necessitate an importation of at least ten times the rocks making up the present jetty. Such a major project in Admiralty Bay will undoubtedly have a major environmental impact, necessitating extensive environmental studies before work can proceed. Option B would also require major ground evacuation of the campground that is part of Fort Casey State Park. Such a major change to the state park will also require thorough environmental studies prior to any work.

Prior to any decision to proceed with either Option A or B, a number of environmental questions would have to be carefully considered and researched. How would major reconstruction to Keystone Harbor and ongoing dredging have on Crockett Lake, a vital stopover site for migrating birds? What mitigating action would be necessary to offset the effect of removing the pilings in the Conservation Dive Area, a site used by both pigeon guillemots and several species of cormorants?

Option C would require no changes to the Keystone Harbor and would allow WSF to move forward with larger capacity ferries and allow for the possibility of developing modern, faster and more fuel efficient vessels that potentially could be the model for future ferry development. Option C carries no environmental risk, allows for increase ferry capacity, could likely be implemented more quickly, and is an opportunity for WSF to use the uniqueness of Keystone Harbor to develop the ferry of the future.

Whidbey Audubon Society strongly urges Washington Ferry System to consider the precious, unique, environmentally sensitive, location of Keystone Harbor with Fort Casey State Park on one side, Keystone Conservation Dive Area on the other side, and Crockett Lake, a designated Important Bird Area across the road from the ferry and choose Option C as the future path for Keystone Ferry.

06ScopingID:	**Organization:**	**Comment Date:**	**Comment Categories:**
33	Port of Port Townsend	4/27/2006	Alternative A: Jetty 300' East Marine Waterways Out of Harbor Alternative

Comment Source:
Mail – Agency Scoping

Comment:
I attended the April 6, 2006 Department of Transportation session on the Keystone Project. It was a great meeting which included a field trip where we saw the Keystone site and had the four alternatives explained in detail. I later briefed the Port of Port Townsend Commission on the project and we reviewed the pros and cons for each alternative.

The Port Commission directed me to provide formal comment on the alternative we see as the preferred solution. That alternative is Alternative A. It provides the best combination of allowing the new larger capacity vessel, the additional widening of the narrow harbor for safety, and the least apparent, environmental impact.

The options which keep a smaller vessel on the route are both unacceptable. The flexibility of allowing larger vessels is needed to address future traffic needs as well as emergency evacuations (either direction) should we have the need due to earthquake or other disaster.

I have to say – we were a bit dismayed that other sites further south along the shoreline were arbitrarily dismissed. These appear to provide for better safety of operations with fewer ferry run cancellations due to tidal conditions. Also

moving the entire operation away from Crockett Lake would allow for a wonderful environmental mitigation project. But, again, if as presented, we must only look at the four alternatives – then "A" is preferred.

The Port of Port Townsend stands ready to help in this important project. If we can be of assistance please let me know. I can be reached at (360) 385-3656 or by email: Larry@portofpt.com. Thank you for the opportunity to provide this comment.

06ScopingID: 34
Organization: N/A
Comment Date: 4/27/2006
Comment Source: Email

Comment Categories:
Alternative A: Jetty 300' East
Alternative B: Jetty Extended
Alternative C: Propulsion System Vessel
Alternative D: Keystone Special Vessel
Local Traffic
Parks & Recreation
Improve Public Safety
Pedestrian/Bicycle
Proximity to SR 20/525
Visual Impact

Comment:

As a homeowner within approximately 1 mile of the Keystone ferry, I have some concerns regarding changes to the ferry landing and boat size. I think this is a very unique area and feel any changes that take place should improve rather than distract from the area.

My biggest concern is any increase of traffic on Main Street/ Engle Road. Already when the ferry drops off a load of cars, the traffic can be challenging as it cuts up Engle Road to Coupeville. Semi trucks and cars traveling 50 mph and faster through one of the most beautiful historical reserves in the nation just doesn't seem right. As a cyclist or even as a motorist, I can hardly enjoy the views because of many drivers in a hurry to catch or leave the ferry. I don't even let my kids ride along Engle Road because of the high speeds of the vehicles when the ferry lets out. Larger boats would just increase the number of vehicles being unloaded on to the road at each drop off.

One solution may be to route the traffic around the area keeping them on the main highways (SR 20). Maybe a speed limit of 25mph or 35mph on Engle Road and/or a weight limit to keep the large trucks from taking the short cut would help achieve this. As far as the ferry landing goes, my vote is to keep it the same and keep the smaller boats. I know it's challenging for the ferry captains, but I'm sure newer boats would be more powerful and maneuverable than the old boats.

I absolutely love the Ebey's National Historical Reserve, and I'm sure I am not alone when a say that changes can be scary. I do realize you have some very hard decisions ahead of you, but this area deserves extra consideration when changes are made. I just hope we can preserve this area and not let more commuter car and truck traffic distract from the beauty of Ebey's Prairie.

Thank you for the opportunity to voice a few of my concerns.

06ScopingID: 35
Organization: N/A
Comment Date: 4/27/2006
Comment Source: Email

Comment Categories:
Alternative A: Jetty 300' East
Alternative B: Jetty Extended
Geology & Soils
Type of Vessel
Wildlife & Vegetation

Comment:

I am writing to comment on the Keystone Ferry project proposals that were published in the March 15 Port Townsend Leader.

I believe that there will be an increasing demand on the Port Townsend-Keystone ferry route in the future, and thus feel that improvements that provide for higher capacity are important. Of the four alternative that were listed as being considered for Keystone, my vote is for alternative A (relocation 300 ft East), because it appears that can be done with the least disturbance to the coast or marine sediments, and it also appears from the published alternatives that relocating the jetty 300 ft to the East has the same benefit in terms of increased capacity as option B, extending the ferry and widening the harbor.

06ScopingID:	**Organization:**	**Comment Date:**	**Comment Categories:**
36	Washington Scuba Alliance	4/27/2006	Alternative A: Jetty 300' East Economics Fisheries Geology & Soils Parks & Recreation Wildlife & Vegetation Ebey's Landing Historic Reserve

Comment Source:
Email

Comment:

The Washington Scuba Alliance represents the dive community in Washington State. We are consistent, long term users of shore diving at Fort Casey State Park and the Keystone Marine Conservation Area. Our use of these facilities occurs not just underwater, but includes use of many amenities shared in common by visitors to the park. These include parking, water, restrooms, beach access trails, picnic tables, and campsites. Please accept the attached comments into the EIS scoping phase of the Keystone Terminal Project. Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this phase of the project. We look forward to continued participation.

The Washington Scuba Alliance understands the need for redeveloping the Keystone Ferry Terminal.

Further, we have a strong vested interest in the existing dive site immediately adjacent to the terminal facility. Divers were delighted when the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife chose the dive site to manage the site as a fully protected Marine Conservation Area.

See Attachment A - Keystone Conservation Area for a description of the marine conservation area from Washington Dept. of Fish & Wildlife.

Clearly the redevelopment project will have serious and highly negative short term impacts on the dive site and the conservation area. It should not, however, result in a permanent loss of protected habitat and the permanent loss of an important regional dive destination.

Therefore, we expect a seat at the planning table to ensure the interests of the dive community and marine environment are incorporated into the planning process and ultimately reflected in a new dive facility and conservation area still adjacent to the new terminal.

Keystone Underwater Park – An Important Dive Tourism Resource

Keystone is a top dive destination in the Pacific Northwest. It is well-known and much-used. The strong current environment at Keystone creates a challenge for ferry traffic, but those same nutrient-rich currents have nourished an incredible abundance of marine life in the 55 years since the jetty was constructed. Every square inch of the jetty is encrusted with life:

Pink hydrocorals
Tiny colonial tunicates
Marine snails, sponges and ascidians
Crabs, sculpins, nudibranchs, tubeworms
Rockfish with a lifespan exceeding 50 years
Giant pacific octopus
Lingcod as big as children
A dozen different types of sea stars
Huge barnacles
An anemone garden which covers thousands of square feet

For this reason, divers travel from not only from all parts of Washington but from Montana, Idaho, Oregon and Canada to enjoy the dive experience at Keystone.

See Attachment B – The Dive Experience at Keystone.

Comments Regarding the Proposed Alternatives

Of the four alternatives identified for evaluation in the EIS, the Washington Scuba Alliance is aware that Alternative A may best address the needs of the state's ferry system. Our understanding is that Alternative A (jetty relocation 300 feet to the east) provides the optimal solution for purposes of safely negotiating the entrance to Keystone Harbor. If it were to be chosen, we would endorse the choice, but recognize that of all the alternatives, it is the one with the most impact to the existing dive site and marine conservation area. Should Alternative A be chosen, we provide the following specific comments.

Marine Conservation Area Boundary

Should Alternative A be chosen, the resulting harbor entrance and relocated jetty would move approximately 300 feet of the existing jetty and conservation area. Our comments are:

-It is important to note the Keystone MCA was originally established to provide recreation opportunities both for scuba divers and the recreational saltwater fishing community. Divers use the east side of the jetty. Recreational saltwater fishermen use the west side of the jetty from shore and boats. There is a pink salmon fishery to the east and south of the existing MCA. Any proposal for movement of the boundary should include participation by the dive community and the recreational fishing community as well as WA Dept. of Fish & Wildlife and WA State Parks & Recreation at a minimum.

-As a dive site, Keystone consists of two primary dives: a jetty dive and a piling dive. Both dive opportunities should be preserved in any new configuration. WSA would oppose any plan that resulted in a reduction of these two primary dive opportunities.

-Ensure the legal boundary description of the existing marine conservation area, as described in WAC 220-16-760: "Keystone Conservation Area", is amended to reflect the new configuration of the site.

-Mark the boundary of the marine conservation area with marker buoys maintained on a permanent basis by WA DOT.

-Create an agreement / management plan with WA Dept. of Transportation that permanently precludes placement of dredge material within the boundary of the relocated marine conservation area unless that placement is part of a designed placement plan created with the agreement of WA Dept. of Fish & Wildlife and the dive community.

Jetty and Reef Construction

Should Alternative A be chosen, it will require destruction of the existing jetty and creation of a new jetty 300 feet to the east. This has the potential to destroy a massive quantity of very high quality marine life. Mitigate this impact as follows:

-Plan construction activities so that while taking the existing jetty apart, as many of the armor rocks as possible are moved in such a way that the encrusting organisms make the move alive and intact.

-Consider partially constructing the new jetty before dismantling the existing jetty.

-Consider construction methodologies and equipment that avoid stockpiling existing armor rock out of water and that minimize handling of armor rock with encrusted organisms.

-Keep to an absolute minimum the time spent out of the water for encrusted armor rocks, helping to preserve life attached to these rocks.

-Construct the new jetty from new material, but armor it with existing armor rocks from the current jetty.

-Find out from marine scientist's how long organisms will survive out of water while being moved and plan construction activity to ensure creatures do not remain out of water beyond this time frame.

-Incorporate underwater "stop signs" toward the end of the jetty. These might be man-made objects, referenced in the safety information signage (see below), that warn divers not to proceed during high ebb current conditions, thereby helping to keep divers out of ferry lanes.

-The thought has occurred to us that construction activity might require the removal of the old Fort Casey loading wharf pilings. These pilings are a key component of the existing dive site. Removal of the pilings would destroy both the dive opportunity and the significant amount of marine life growing on them. If any of the pilings are to be removed from the wharf, mitigate this impact as follows:

-Construct an artificial reef to replace the dive opportunity currently served by the pilings. Construct this reef before dismantling the existing jetty and removing the pilings. This may allow fish and mobile critters to move on their own, or provide an attachment substrate for organisms dislodged during piling removal and jetty relocation.

-Consider timing the movement of jetty rock or pilings to coincide with flood tides so that dislodged organisms flow toward the new reef.

-Seed the new reef with rocks from the existing jetty.

-Place groupings of encrusted armor rock from the existing jetty in the new reef area.

-Consider the use of reef balls, vertically oriented concrete structure, or other benign substrate materials in construction of the new reef.

Beach Access & Shore Facilities

-Provide an entry / exit ramp built into the "hardscape" of the new jetty for access from parking lot to staging area to the beach to the water by both able and disabled divers.

-Ensure stable footing from the parking lot and staging area to the water. Long ramps are better than stairs for many divers. 1" crushed rock makes for good footing. Smooth rock or gravel is less desirable because it is less stable underfoot for gear-laden divers, particularly when it has been raining. Steep slopes are to be avoided.

-Provide expanded changing facilities in relocated restrooms.

-Provide hot showers in the restrooms. Could be coin operated.

-Provide outside freshwater rinse stations (2).

-Provide heaters in the restroom / changing facilities. Could be coin operated.

-Staging. Provide hardscape features or very sturdy picnic tables close to the water and parking. Diving involves heavy gear. Moving it and staging it for entry into the water is a big part of diving. Park layouts that locate staging structures like picnic benches close to both the water and parking are excellent. Staging is an important element of diving and involves the following key elements:

-A place to unload dive gear in reasonably close proximity to the entry/exit point of the dive. This avoids long hauls of heavy dive gear and/or long walks while wearing the dive gear.

-A flat place off the ground to lay out and assemble dive gear. The key considerations in this regard are sufficient space to lay out gear and being off the ground. A space the size of a picnic table top can reasonably accommodate two divers.

-A way for the diver to back up to, sit down, and don the scuba gear without having to lift it off the ground. Think of a feature like the seat on a picnic table. The process is reversed at the end of a dive to remove equipment.

-Construct a gazebo-like covered structure with windbreaks so that divers can stage gear and don/doff gear close to the water on rainy days. Perhaps something similar to covered picnic facilities.

-Place signage in and around the area as follows:

-Underwater pictures and information on marine life in the park for both divers and non-divers and as an attraction for waiting passengers

-Safety information for divers: a dive briefing on the park with information on the features of both dives, entry/exit points, current conditions, as well as how to stay out of the ferry lane.

-Fund a study led by WA Dept. of Fish & Wildlife and including participation by marine science schools like Western Washington University's Shannon Point Marine Center, Walla Walla College's Marine Station and the University of Washington to study the colonization patterns and rates on the new jetty and any new reef materials (for example: reef balls) placed east of the new jetty.

Attachment A - Keystone Conservation Area

WAC 220-16-760
http://apps.leg.wa.gov/wac/default.aspx?cite=220-16-760

"Keystone Conservation Area" is defined as all bedlands and tidelands and the waters over these starting at the extreme high water line on the east side of the Keystone jetty in Fort Casey State Park then easterly along the extreme high water line to a line projected from shore through the easternmost row of pilings of the old military wharf, then offshore along that line southeasterly for 600 feet, then southwest parallel to the shoreline to a point due south of the southern tip of the jetty, then north to the extreme high water line on the southern tip of the jetty, then along the extreme high water line on the east side of the jetty to the point of origin.

[Statutory Authority: RCW 77.12.047. 02-17-017 (Order 02-187), § 220-16-760, filed 8/9/02, effective 9/9/02; 02-08-048 (Order 02-53), § 220-16-760, filed 3/29/02, effective 5/1/02.]

Attachment B - The Dive Experience at Keystone

Taken verbatim from "Northwest Shore Dives", second edition, by Stephen Fischnaller. Pages 151 – 155. This is the bible for shore dive descriptions in the Pacific Northwest.

Habitat and Depth: The current-swept Keystone Jetty is a magical world where cabezon and lingcod disappear into walls of white plumose anemones with the flick of their tails. It is also a world where clouds of sandlances shimmer in the sunlight as they sweep past overhead, swimming in unison as one entity. Large boulders piled on top of each other form the jetty, providing hundreds of hiding places into which animals can easily retreat. The rocks provide an immense structural support for bull kelp, as well as many invertebrates, such as heart crabs, giant acorn barnacles and a variety of sea stars and anemones. East of the jetty is a group of old pilings where divers will find still more plumose anemones. Bushes of purple and green feather duster worms, Puget Sound's largest species of tube worm, are also found here. Other animals common to this beautiful wildlife preserve include schools of rockfish and herring, kelp greenling, whitespotted greenling, painted greenling, tube-snouts, sea urchins, sea cucumbers, shrimp, crab, nudibranchs, chitons, limpets, and an occasional wolf-eel or octopus. A sandy bottom stretches between wharf pilings and a rock jetty. Bottom depths on the outside of the pilings and at the end of the jetty reach 28 feet and 62 feet respectively (10 foot tide).

Site Description: Enter the water on the east side of the jetty, submerge, and begin to explore the large boulders. Divers will quickly discover that the jetty is built like a pyramid, with more rocks extending beneath the surface than above. It is a good location for both wide-angle and macro photography. If the current allows, the end of the jetty and opposite side are fun to explore, too.

An alternate dive can be made around a group of old wharf pilings during either flood or ebb exchanges. The pilings are covered with small colorful animals that are fun to watch or photograph. After exploring the pilings, divers can often ride the current toward the jetty (see the Hazards section and map on pages 152 – 154 for a description of current patterns). As they near the jetty, they should start swimming for shore before the current flow changes direction and begins to flow out along the jetty. During the early part of a flood exchange, the water is moving in the opposite direction. At this time, divers can drift from the jetty to the pilings. When swimming in current, remember to swim with the flow or perpendicular to it, but not against it.

Visibility is usually best during the last part of a flood exchange and during slack before ebb.

Skill Level: Intermediate divers.

Hazards: Strong current, fishing line and kelp. Ferry traffic and small boats are additional hazards when diving on the side of the jetty closest to the ferry pier and boat launch. When diving on this side of the jetty, be sure to stay out of the ferry traffic and small boat lanes by staying close to the jetty.

During the initial phase of a flood exchange, water flows in along the jetty, then turns in the shallows and flows parallel to shore toward the old wharf. A second slack occurs during a flood cycle when the flow reverses and begins to flow toward the jetty.

A true slack before ebb does not occur at Keystone. Instead, the current only slows before picking up speed again and continuing to flow southwest, past the wharf toward the jetty. Currents flow out along the jetty during both ebb exchanges and the last half of flood exchanges. During large exchanges, current striking the jetty will divide into two segments; one flowing out along the jetty, and one flowing inshore.

Use a current table (not a tide table) to plan your dive at Keystone. Enter the water approximately 30 minutes before the predicted time for slack current. If you should find yourself in current, remember that the flow is slower on the bottom. Also, rocks can be used for hand holds to pull yourself along the jetty. Use the big boulders for shelter from current if a rest is needed.

Facilities: Rest rooms with hot showers, an outside cold shower for cleaning equipment, picnic tables, a boat launch, and parking. There is a restaurant across the street from the park. Air fills are available in Oak Harbor, Port Townsend, and Anacortes.

Travel Distance and Directions: Keystone State Park is located in Admiralty Bay on the west side of Whidbey Island, 5 miles south of Coupeville
Mileage from Bellingham = 66 miles
Mileage from Seattle = 47 miles
Mileage from Olympia = 96 miles

Current Table: Admiralty Inlet. Look up the daily current predictions for Admiralty Inlet. Apply the following time corrections to calculate slack current times:
Time corrections for subordinate station 965:
Minimum current before flood: -31 minutes
Minimum current before ebb: +01 minutes

Telephone Location: Across the street at the restaurant.

Non-Diver Activities: Visit the concrete gun emplacements at Fort Casey, ride the ferry to Port Townsend (there are many interesting shops and restaurants in this historical seaport), go for a walk along the beach, fish from the jetty, catch some sunshine on the sandy beach, camp, picnic, or barbecue a meal at Fort Casey State Park.

06ScopingID:
37

Organization:
N/A

CommentDate:
4/27/2006

Comment Source:
Email

Comment Categories:
Alternative A: Jetty 300' East
Alternative B: Jetty Extended
Alternative C: Propulsion System Vessel
Alternative D: Keystone Special Vessel
Frequency/Schedule
Reliability
Type of Vessel
Vehicle Holding

Comment:

In evaluating alternatives for the Keystone Ferry project, please give priority to increasing the reliability of service. I ask that you alternative that reduces delays and cancellations due to low tides, currents, fog, and other weather problems. Alternatives A, B, and C all seem to offer increased reliability of service. I'll leave it to the engineering and environmental experts to determine which alternative would offer the most reliable service, while minimizing adverse environmental impacts.

Please consider whether extending the dock farther out into the water would reduce adverse environmental impacts. It

seems that the churning and wave action at the shoreline would be reduced if the ferry docks farther from shore. Would this allow better growth of eelgrass or other grasses in the area, and benefit other plants and animals in the intertidal zone? It's my understanding that shoreline and tidal zones are more environmentally sensitive than deeper water areas.

Large holding areas are needed when vehicles don't fit onto a smaller ferry, and have to wait at the dock for the next ferry. Paved areas generally are considered to have an adverse impact on the environment. Some people may assume that larger vessels would necessitate proportionately larger holding areas. I want to point out that the size of the parking lot needed is also affected by the number of vehicles waiting for the next run, due to delayed/cancelled runs and small vessels.

The long backups of vehicles that result from delayed/cancelled runs do not offer any benefit to the environment. Instead, the result is frustrated drivers, sometimes idling engines in cold weather to stay warm. Such unreliability of schedule also harms businesses, due to unpredictable delivery schedules and freight mobility problems. Tourism is harmed when visitors spend their day in a ferry line, instead of enjoying the day and spending money in the small towns on both sides of the run. This includes "local" visitors, i.e., people from Whidbey Island trying to visit Port Townsend for the day, and vice versa.

Delays and cancellations (e.g., fog delays) can occur on other ferry routes, but they are far less frequent. My understanding is that Keystone is the most (or one of the most) difficult WSF facilities for docking. Low tide cancellations in the morning sometimes cause delays in the ferry runs for the rest of the day and evening.

We use this ferry route for travel to Whidbey Island, Bellingham (to visit friends), the Skagit Valley, and the North Cascades Highway (Rt. 20). If we pay money for tickets to an event on Whidbey Island or Bellingham, it can be money down the drain if fog predicted time for slack current rolls in. Likewise for people trying to travel to Port Townsend for Centrum music performances or other events. The uncertainty about when (or even IF) the ferry will arrive at Keystone makes it difficult to make plans to meet up with friends at a particular time on the other side of the route. I realize that there are worse problems to have, but it's time to make the Port Townsend-Keystone ferry route a more reliable part of the WSF system, which is an important transportation system in our state.

My dream would be increased reliability of schedule, without any reduction in the number of runs. An increase in the frequency of runs would be welcome, if ridership projections justify it.

Please do something. I hope that alternative D, or the no action alternative, will not be chosen. Thank you for considering these comments.

06ScopingID:
38

Organization:
Ebey's Landing National Historic Reserve – National Park Service

CommentDate:
4/26/2006

Comment Source:
Mail – Agency Scoping

Comment Categories:
Alternative A: Jetty 300' East
Alternative C: Propulsion System Vessel
Local Traffic
Parks & Recreation
Transportation
Wildlife & Vegetation
Ebey's Landing Historic Reserve
Out of Harbor Alternative
Proximity to SR 20/525
Type of Vessel

Comment:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide scoping comments on the Keystone Ferry Terminal Improvement Project. This letter includes the combined comments of both the Trust Board of Ebey's Landing and National Park Service staff.

Traffic Impacts
Increases in traffic volumes and changes in the nature of that traffic should be comprehensively assessed. Alternatives to routing traffic along Engle Road should be developed and given adequate consideration.

The current route of the majority of northbound and southbound traffic from SR 20 to the terminal is by way of South Main Street and Engle Road. This route takes ferry traffic through the Camp Casey campus, Ebey's Prairie, which is the heart of Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve, the campus of the Coupeville Middle/High School, the commercial area of South Main Street, and Coupeville Elementary School. Increased traffic volumes will create direct and indirect adverse impacts on the operation of these existing community and National Park Service facilities. Additionally, the cumulative effects of traffic impacts on function of the overall circulation network of Central Whidbey Island should be assessed.

Not only the volume of traffic but also the nature of the traffic should be assessed. The impact of increased commercial truck traffic due to the expansion of the Keystone run should be considered. Additionally, the effects of larger ferry capacity and the resulting increase in periodic congestion at key public facilities and intersections needs to be assessed and either prevented or mitigated.

Alternatives to using the existing Engle Road route must be considered at this time. Perhaps design features of the new terminal can more effectively direct traffic east, along SR 20, rather than north, onto local country roads. Neither Fort Casey Road nor Engle Road is a suitable route for increasing traffic volumes, especially commercial truck traffic. Measures to mitigate impacts on these roads need to be explored as part of this project review.

Impacts to Cultural Resources
The Quartermaster Dock, east of the jetty is a contributing resource to the Central Whidbey Island Historic District. Other features of the Fort Casey complex, such as the Powerhouse and portions of the roadway and pedestrian circulation network are significant and should be retained or at least considered during the development and assessment of a preferred alternative. The impacts of a relocated jetty should be considered. The impact of modified traffic patterns and volume on cultural landscape features such as Camp Casey and Ebey's Prairie should be assessed.

Steel Electric Class
The history of the Steel Electric vessels should be documented prior to their retirement. Interpretive facilities at the terminals, or onboard ferries assigned to the Keystone-Pt Townsend run could effectively communicate this story to the public. As part of the environmental review process, the vessels, which are over 50 years of age, need to be evaluated for historic register eligibility.

Impacts to Natural Resources
Informal plan surveys of Keystone Spit have revealed a surprisingly diverse native plan community in portions of the Spit. If proposed improvements include expanding the footprint of disturbed areas, a survey of native plant communities should be performed during the appropriate season and adequate mitigation measures proposed.

The potential for improving the salmon habitat value of Crockett Lake at some time in the future should be considered during planning for this project. If possible, improvements made now should not preclude use of the Keystone Harbor as an element of future enhancement projects.

Impacts to Recreation Resources
Relocation of the existing jetty may have an effect on depositional sediments and the frequency and volume of dredging of the harbor. The impacts of this ongoing maintenance dredging on the underwater park resources of Fort Casey State Park should be assessed and adequate mitigation proposed.

Encroachment of terminal improvements into the operations of Ft. Casey State Park should be kept to a minimum. Fort Casey State Park has experienced steady growth in visitation. If State Park resources are impacted, adequate mitigation will be essential.

Range of Alternatives
To be comprehensive, we recommend that the assessment process consider other options including: a "no action" alternative, and alternative that places a terminal outside of the boundaries of the Ebey's Landing NHR/Central Whidbey Island Historic District – such as the "red barn site' – and an alternative that utilizes a shallow draft vessel design with special propulsion. Newer hull designs and propulsion systems are becoming common in ferries throughout the world and these recent developments should be given serious consideration for the project. Any of these alternatives could do away with the need for alterations to the existing harbor.

Design Features of Terminal Improvements
The Keystone terminal lies within the Central Whidbey Island Historic District and Ebey's Landing National Historic Reserve. The overall design of a potential terminal site, as well as the detailed designs of individual buildings and improvements should be tailored to this unique and nationally significant area. The environmental assessment must document the rural and open character of the site. Further, mitigative actions need to be identified that will assure that development associated with the site, does not adversely affect the rural historic district – including elements such as traffic control devices and facilities.

If it is determined that improvements to the harbor are needed, a collaborative design charrette early in the planning process would benefit this project. Such a collaborative design process would help to avoid conflicts between agencies and user groups; make the best use of the limited area available; and avoid potential adverse environmental impacts.

We look forward to working constructively with WSDOT and State Parks to balance the needs of travelers, recreational visitors and the Coupeville community.

06ScopingID: 39

Organization: State Parks Commission

Comment Date: 4/28/2006

Comment Source: Mail – Agency Scoping

Comment Categories:
Alternative A: Jetty 300' East
Alternative B: Jetty Extended
Alternative C: Propulsion System Vessel
Alternative D: Keystone Special Vessel
Economics
Historic, Cultural, Archeological
Land Use
Parks & Recreation
Wildlife & Vegetation
Ebey's Landing Historic Reserve
Hydraulics
Out of Harbor Alternative

Comment:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the scoping phase of the proposed Keystone Ferry Project. As you could imagine, the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission (State Parks) is tremendously interested in this project due to the potential impacts to both the upland and underwater resources of Fort Casey State Park, as well as to the surrounding area.

My staff and I have reviewed the information provided for this initial scoping phase, including maps outlining the four alternatives being considered. We assume that, per WAC 197-11-400, Washington State Ferries has determined that these four alternatives are the only 'reasonable alternatives' to be addressed in the EIS. Therefore, the following comments relate to Alternative A through D based on the information provided thus far; should other potential sites outside of Keystone Harbor be considered at a later date, State Parks also wishes to be contacted for specific comment.

ENVIRONMENT

Alternatives A and B propose significant change to the harbor and dredging practices. How will these changes impact the marine environment within and adjacent to the harbor? Any proposed changes to the existing harbor and jetty could have long-lasting impacts that extend far from the immediate vicinity of the harbor. Will Washington State Ferries perform a scientifically viable analysis of the changes to littoral drift, beach bluff processes, beach accretion, and near shore habitat?

Dredge spoils are currently used to augment the beach east of the harbor, above which State Parks maintains a day use area. If any of the options alter dredging amounts from current levels, what impacts would there be to the site where the dredge material is currently deposited and to the day use area? What proposed measures would you use to avoid or reduce these impacts?

Alternative A would result in disruption of existing habitat on and adjacent to the jetty. How would this alternative impact marine life? Would mitigation for this impact result in replacement in kind of the existing habitat? How long would it take to bring the area back to a stable condition, enriched with the current volume and diversity of marine life?

Will there be impacts to the remnant military wharf and those species which inhabit this structure? What mitigation measures would be proposed?

Crockett Lake is an important feeding and staging area for migratory birds. Surveys have validated that 17 species of migratory shorebirds use it as a migration stopover site. What will be the impacts of construction activity on these birds? Will changes in traffic patterns and volumes have an effect on the use of Crockett Lake by migratory species? The military wharf is a nesting site for Pigeon Guillemot (Cephus columba). What will be the impacts to species using this site? The existing jetty is commonly used by Harlequin Duck (Historionicus historionicus) as a winter foraging area. What will be the impact to this species should the jetty be relocated or enlarged?

RECREATION

Fort Casey Campground is one of the state's most popular campgrounds, providing camping opportunities throughout the year directly adjacent to a saltwater beach. Alternative A would result in abolition of the campground west of the harbor. Reconstruction of a campground between the bluff and the proposed harbor edge would likely not be possible given constraints of infrastructure, design, and safety/access. Please address this in the analysis of Alternative A.

For Alternatives A and B, please address the potential impacts to the campground beach area due to increased vessel wake and/or prop wash.

How will dredging for each of the alternatives impact the immediate campground area? What changes to the immediate campground/beach area can be expected? What measures do you propose to implement to protect and minimize impact to the existing campground and associated beach area?

A Marine Protected Area is situated adjacent to the ferry terminal. This "underwater park" is one of the most popular diving areas in Puget Sound. Important elements of the conservation area include the jetty and remnants of the historic wharf, both of which are inhabited by abundant marine life.

For each alternative, what will be the short-term and long-term impacts and mitigation measures used to protect this popular recreation resource?

A public boat ramp is situated on the east side of the harbor and is very popular with the boating public. What would the short-term and long-term impacts to users of this facility be under each of the alternatives? What proposed measures will be used to avoid or reduce such impacts?

For each of the alternatives, please address noise, light and glare, odor, and aesthetic impacts of the vessels and ferry terminal to campground, boat launch and beach users.

What will be the impacts to visitor access and traffic flow to the campground, boat launch and upland park area under each alternative both during construction and operation?

Also, for each alternative, how do you propose to maintain the safety of the diving and boating public?

CULTURAL RESOURCES
Widely considered by military historians as one of the most intact and best-maintained forts on the West Coast, Fort Casey has been operated as either a military garrison or a public park for well over one hundred years. Fort Casey State Park and the Admiralty Head Lighthouse are separately listed in the National Register of Historic Places and are part of the Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve. The park has been chosen as the interpretive centerpiece for coastal fortifications in the State of Washington and has been designated a "Model Stewardship Park" by the State Parks Commission. During the next several years, State Parks and our active group of volunteers will greatly enhance the experience for our 700,000 annual visitors by reconstructing new "old" buildings and significantly ramping up our static and in-person interpretive capacity. Close consideration must be given to the potential impacts of any proposal to each single aspect of this unique site, as well as the sum total of the current visitor experience.

It is likely that archeological resources also exist in and adjacent to Keystone Harbor. An investigation and assessment of these resources will need to be conducted during the analysis of the alternatives of this proposal.

In summary, this 467-acre park is a unique and popular facility, protecting and providing access to a long list of natural, historic, archeological, and recreational resources. The protected underwater park is one of the most popular diving spots in the state. The shore side campground is extremely well used and serves as an important revenue source for State Parks. Crockett Lake is an important migratory bird haven and bird viewing area. Historic Fort Casey has been chosen as a model for stewardship of our state's assets. This important public facility needs and deserves to be protected.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important project and please feel free to contact me with any questions.

06ScopingID:
40

Organization:
Island County
Board of Commissioners

Comment Date:
4/26/2006

Comment Source:
Mail – Agency Scoping

Comment Categories:
Alternative A: Jetty 300' East
Alternative B: Jetty Extended
Economics
Parks & Recreation
Wildlife & Vegetation
Type of Vessel

Comment:

Attached please find a letter from the Island County Marine Resources Committee (MRC). The MRC is charged under Island County Code to protect and enhance the marine habitat of Island County. The MRC's letter addresses concerns that impact marine habitat and marine businesses regarding the Keystone Ferry Terminal project undergoing scoping. The concerns of MRC are our concerns as well. We fully support the work of the Committee and submit these questions

to be addressed during the process of determining which options Washington State Ferries will eventually prepare an EIS for.

The concerns address only the marine habitat and maritime business impacts of the four alternatives. It is clear that options "A" and "B" would have devastating impacts on the marine environment and related businesses. We strongly request that a non-biased evaluation of all of these alternatives be undertaken and that priorities for selection of a final option be based on minimization of habitat loss, support of local business, traffic disruption and safety of crew and passengers.

We do not consider the Keystone location to be ordinary, rather, quite extraordinary, and one of the jewels of Island County through its vista, relationship to a major State Park, and unparalleled habitats. This should be placed well above organizational needed that would standardize the Washington State Ferries fleet.

Please contact the Island County Marine Resources Committee directly or through us if you have any questions or concerns about the issues raised and how you might address them.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

06ScopingID:	**Name:**	**Comment Date:**	**Comment Categories:**
41	N/A	4/28/2006	Alternative A: Jetty 300' East Alternative B: Jetty Extended Frequency/Schedule Reliability Type of Vessel

Comment Source:
Email

Comment:
If larger vessels are employed on this route, please do not conclude that the number of runs can be reduced. That would be going backwards, in trying to improve this route. The number of sailings already is quite limited.

We live in Port Townsend, but also own property on Whidbey Island. The gaps in the schedule often make it difficult to find a sailing time that is anywhere close to the timing of what we need to do on the Whidbey side.

It's important to choose an alternative that will not be outdated and inadequate, capacity wise, within a few years.

I sent a comment letter by mail yesterday. I want to add these comments as well. Thank you.

06ScopingID:	**Name:**	**Comment Date:**	**Comment Categories:**
42	N/A	4/28/2006	Alternative A: Jetty 300' East Alternative B: Jetty Extended Wildlife & Vegetation Parks & Recreation

Comment source:
Email

Comment:
As a marine biologist and SCUBA diver I oppose alternative A-moving the jetty. The marine life currently living on the jetty rivals that found in the rocky reef habitats in the San Juan archipelago and provides shore divers with easy access to the diversity of life present in Puget Sound. Not only are rocky reefs relatively rare in Puget Sound, but the no-take marine reserve at Keystone is one of only a few areas with such protection. Moving the jetty would deprive divers of one of the best dive areas in the state for the next 50 years as the slow growing and territorial marine organisms slowly return to the new jetty. I have over 150 dives in the San Juan Islands and some animals I have only observed at the Keystone jetty. Adding on to the existing jetty would also be an appropriate option. A significant increase in the rocky reef habitat extending to deeper depths may increase species diversity and abundance and perhaps make Keystone "THE" best shore dive in the state of Washington.

06ScopingID:	Name:	Comment Date:	Comment Categories:
43	N/A	4/29/2006	Alternative C: Propulsion System Vessel Parks & Recreation Type of Vessel

Comment Source:
Mail – Comment Form

Comment:

Are there other alternatives WSF should consider?
I favor option C. Strongly oppose moving the boat launch or expanding harbor.

06ScopingID:	Name:	Comment Date:	Comment Categories:
44	N/A	4/29/2006	Alternative C: Propulsion System Vessel Wildlife & Vegetation

Comment Source:
Mail – Comment Form

Comment:

Are there other alternatives WSF should consider?
I vote for option C. Do not destroy our environment, the home to so much wildlife.

06ScopingID:	Name:	Comment Date:	Comment Categories:
45	N/A	4/29/2006	Alternative C: Propulsion System Vessel Alternative D: Keystone Special Vessel Parks & Recreation Water Resources Wildlife & Vegetation Frequency/Schedule Reliability Type of Vessel

Comment Source:
Mail – Comment Form

Comment:

What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?
Please don't destroy any more critical shoreline! We have to be the responsible generation that preserves and protects!

Are there other alternatives WSF should consider?
Yes! In my opinion this is what works! 2 shallow draft 100 car ferries - 1 every 1 1/2 hours in winter, 1 every 45 minutes in summer. Reintroduce the 10:00 pm ferry from Port Townsend. Keep the campground!

Please comment on the purpose and need for this project:
Option C only!

06ScopingID: 46
Name: N/A
Comment Date: 4/29/2006
Comment Source: Mail – Comment Form

Comment Categories:
Alternative C: Propulsion System Vessel
Parks & Recreation
Wildlife & Vegetation
Frequency/Schedule
Reliability
Type of Vessel

Comment:

Are there other alternatives WSF should consider?
Absolutely: 2 shallow draft 100 car ferries - 1 every 1 1/2 hours in winter, 1 every 45 minutes in summer. Use what exists - keep the campground.

Please don't destroy more critical shoreline by moving the ferry dock- make what exists work!

06ScopingID: 47
Name: N/A
Comment Date: 4/29/2006
Comment Source: Mail – Comment Form

Comment Categories:
Alternative C: Propulsion System Vessel
Wildlife & Vegetation
Frequency & Schedule
Type of Vessel

Comment:

Are there other alternatives WSF should consider?
I am for option C: Harbor same size, 2 shallow draft 100 car ferries, 1 every 1 1/2 hours in winter and 1 every 45 minutes in the summer. Building a new boat launch is unnecessary! It would have a detrimental impact to an already sensitive environmental ecosystem!

06ScopingID: 48
Organization: Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife
Comment Date: 4/26/2006
Comment Source: Email – Agency Scoping

Comment Categories:
Alternative A: Jetty 300' East
Alternative B: Jetty Extended
Alternative C: Propulsion System Vessel
Alternative D: Keystone Special Vessel
Geology & Soils
Hazardous Materials
Parks & Recreation
Water Resources
Wildlife & Vegetation
Crockett Lake
Hydraulics
Out of Harbor Alternative
Participating Agencies

Comment:
Thank you for the informative meeting held on April 6, 2006, to review the various alternatives for modifying Keystone Harbor on Whidbey Island. Four alternative methods were proposed in addition to the no build alternative. Two of these alternatives used the existing harbor with new vessel designs, and two required modification to the harbor and existing jetty. The two alternatives that dealt with harbor modification were: (1) alternative A, relocate the jetty 300 feet to the east to accommodate a larger vessel, and (2) alternative B, extend the jetty 600 feet and widen the harbor to the west to accommodate a larger vessel. Comments pertaining to these various design alternatives are listed below:

Alternatives with the least environmental impacts are the no build alternative and the two alternatives that maintain the existing harbor but change vessel design. The Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) supports all of these no build options with the exception that a nearshore salmon "migratory bench" be installed in the existing jetty. As juvenile salmon migrate to sea, they use shallow nearshore habitat. This behavior protects juvenile salmon from predation. Structures along the nearshore that force juvenile salmon into deep water make them more susceptible to predation. A migratory bench or break in the jetty placed at beach grade and extending from the shore to approximately the 0.0 tidal elevation (MLLW=0.0) or lower would allow juvenile salmon to migrate safely along the nearshore area without altering their migratory behavior.

Of the two design alternatives involving moving or lengthening the existing jetty, WDFW would support Alternative A, which entails moving the existing jetty approximately 300 feet to the east along with widening of the harbor.

Due to considerably impacts to existing benthic communities, WDFW does not support Alternative B, which involves lengthening the jetty by 600 feet.

The nearshore migratory bench, built into Alternative A should be constructed similar to that proposed in the draft technical memorandum titled, Keystone Harbor Coastal & Hydraulic Modeling Study Phase – 2 Jetty Relocation and Widening Alternative, prepared by Coast & Harbor Engineering, and dated October 21, 2005, Alternative 4 in this preliminary study showed the bench located at the existing beach profile with a slope of about 10H:1V. In an email sent to WSF, dated January 17, 2006, WDFW proposed that the sidewalls of the bench at the landward and seaward ends be sloped at 5H:1V as opposed to 2H:1V. This would create additional shallow water habitat through the migratory bench/corridor.

Moving the existing breakwater 300-feet to the east would place the new (or rebuilt) breakwater in the middle of the current Keystone Conservation Area (KCA). The current boundaries run from the middle of the existing breakwater to the eastern most pilings on the historic dock. This will result in roughly a 50% reduction in the area of the KCA. The change in the location of the jetty will require changing the legal description of the KCA (at a minimum) and possibly shifting the location of the site.

The KCA was established under WDFW regulation at the request of the Parks and Recreation Commission. Any change in the boundaries (or a revision of the description) will entail consultation among the staff of the two organizations. It was established as a recreational dive site but also for protection of fish that use the jetty (such as rockfish).

Dredging of the ferry slip and inner harbor was discussed during our beach walk. The dredge spoils from this have been used, in part, to "nourish" the beach east of the jetty (within the KCA). Dredging of the ferry dock area is anticipated to continue after revision of the jetty. While it is desirable to provide material to this beach so that it does not erode away, the effect on the KCA should be factored in to design and placement of the material. It would be undesirable if future placement of dredged material filled the subtidal area out from shore and further decreased the amount of in-water area available to the divers. By the same token, recreational dive depths for most participants are shallower than 90 or 100 feet (many do not go deeper than about 60 feet). Consideration of the effect on the KCA as well as on the recreational beach above ordinary high water will be important during maintenance activities.

Recreational fisherman and sport divers use the boat ramp at Keystone Harbor. During construction, an alternative temporary access point should be provided for these user groups.

When considering bank stabilization measures for the new harbor, WDFW recommends that an analysis of "soft shore" armoring methods be conducted.

Relocation of the jetty should be conducted in a manner that preserves the "live rocks", those with attached marine life. Once the core of the new jetty is constructed, these rocks should be placed back onto the outside of the jetty. This will help to maintain the attractive features of the existing jetty for sport divers as the new jetty becomes re-colonized with new marine life.

An out-of-harbor alternative should be explored so that the impacts of this alternative can be evaluated in the EIS vs. impacts associated with an in harbor alternative such as Alternative A discussed above. An out-of-harbor alternative is attractive to WDFW in that the environmental impacts associated with widening the channel and relocating the jetty can be avoided.

Mitigation that WDFW would ask for concerning the Keystone Ferry Project will likely include a project by WSF to restore the saltwater connection between Crockett Lake and Keystone Harbor. An essential first step in this direction would be for WSF to conduct a feasibility study that would identify historical connections between Crockett Lake and Admiralty Inlet, and a hydrological study to predict the extent of tidal flooding in Crockett Lake should historical connections be made.

Other mitigation that WDFW would likely ask for would be the removal of the old pier with its creosote piling that is east

of existing harbor entrance and within the Keystone Conservation Area. WDFW realizes that this structure, with its associated marine life, is an attraction for recreational sport divers. This structure could be replaced, however, with a new, more environmentally friendly structure utilizing untreated wood decking, with light passable grating, and steel or concrete piles. Such a structure would be colonized with new marine invertebrates, macroalgae, and fish life within one to two years after construction.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project. If you have any questions or concerns please call me at (360) 466-4345 ext: 251.

06ScopingID:	**Organization:**	**Comment Date:**	**Comment Comments:**
49	Ebey's Landing National Historic Reserve Board	4/11/2006	Alternative A: Jetty 300' East Alternative B: Jetty Extended Alternative C: Propulsion System Vessel Alternative D: Keystone Special Vessel Local Traffic No Action Parks & Recreation Water Resources Crockett Lake Ebey's Landing Historic Reserve Frequency/Schedule Funding/Costs Hydraulics (e.g. Beach Erosion) Increased Number of Vehicles Participating Agencies Proximity to SR 20/525 Vehicle Holding Vehicle Ingress/Egress/Turnaround Wildlife & Vegetation
Comment Source: Community Briefing			

Comment:

Do the captains have a vessel preference?

Are costs assigned to each of the alternatives?

Is there a difference in operational costs for each of the vessels?

What would be the time between trips for each vessel?

Could the holding area be moved to where the scuba parking lot exists today? That might remove the infringement on the state park area. Before a preferred alternative is picked, the dive park parking could be looked at in detail. Support facilities should be focused at the scuba parking area.

The parking area around the scuba park and boat launch is supposed to only be for boat launch parking.

We may be underestimating the amount of people that use this route for day trips. Perhaps the current holding area could be used for walk-ons in the future.

[The Trust Board] would like to see Crockett Lake revitalized and free-flowing, to provide a tidal area for salmon habitat. Please do not foreclose the ability to change the connection to Crockett Lake for any alternative.

Would there be the typical riprap slope used for a jetty extension?

Does the jetty currently control currents?

The current flows from south to north, pulling sand into Keystone Harbor. Would more frequent dredging be needed for Alternative B?

What is the effect of jetties on beaches?

A jetty created with "hard stuff" is good for sea life.

Would the vessels for alternatives C and D be interchangeable with any of the fleet?

What is the capacity of the current Steel Electric vessels?

When was Keystone Harbor created?

A new vessel with new propulsion system may not work right when it is on the water (as in Alternative C). It may work on paper, but it may not be a dependable option.

Growth will occur in the long-term. A bigger boat seems like a good option.

Will queuing still occur in these harbor/vessel scenarios, or will all vehicles be held in the expanded holding area?

Will there be backups if there is a traffic light at the terminal?

If day parking and queuing run up toward Camp Casey, and there is a long queue, day parking vehicles might not be able to get out of their parking stalls due to a "double parking" effect.

Everyone knows that it takes longer to get to the terminal via the state highway. When vehicles come through town, there is a safety issue at the high school, which is bisected by the road. We will have an exaggerated safety issue as lines get longer coming from and going toward the terminal. A traffic light at the school may be needed, so that the kids will follow it also.

Perhaps a solution for traffic might be to require trucks to go one way to the terminal, and passenger cars to go the opposite. Maybe thought should be given to a size or weight standard requiring vehicles to go through town or along the state highway.

Increased traffic affects our way of life. Could this route be kept as a "limited route?"

Could there be a run from Anacortes to Port Townsend?

Signs will not keep people from going through Coupeville. It's difficult because there are two ways to get to the terminal.

Perhaps a way to curtail traffic issues would be to close off access to the terminal from Engle Road (to/from north of the terminal).

A traffic solution would be to move the terminal down to Admirals' Cove for direct access, but the Legislature vetoed that idea.

The harbor may not be the best place for a terminal any more. Perhaps moving traffic straight up the hill would be better.

This is an awful harbor to sail in and out of.

What does a No Action really mean?

A design charrette would be a great idea for this project.

When will final decisions for the alternatives be made?

Who makes a decision on which alternatives to include in the analysis?

What is the life expectancy of the Issaquah-class vessels?

What is the difference in cost between the vessels?

Who came to the agency-scoping meeting from the parks department?

The National Historic Reserve (NHR) is supposed to have a different pace of life – more and more traffic coming through doesn't mimic that.

The NHR has a self-guided driving tour, and if a road were closed, there would be a conflict.

The NHR Trust Board oversees the National Historic Reserve, and we try to retain the character within the reserve. We are independent of National Parks, and can lobby for it. People want the Reserve to succeed. We see the NHR as a living, working landscape.

The Trust Board is made up of nine members, with people from Island County Commissioners, Coupeville, State Parks and Federal Parks.

There's a good opportunity for mitigation at Crockett Lake.

Some areas near the existing terminal have been purchased with Land and Water Conservation Funds and will need appropriate mitigation if impacted.

06ScopingID:
50

Name:
Department of Ecology

Comment Date:
5/5/2006

Comment Source:
Mail – Agency Scoping

Comment Categories:
Alternative A: Jetty 300' East
Alternative B: Jetty Extended
Alternative C: Propulsion System Vessel
Alternative D: Keystone Special Vessel
Parks & Recreation
Visual Quality
Water Resources
Wildlife & Vegetation
WSF Policy Decision

Comment:
Dear Mr. Torres,

The Washington State Department of Ecology, Shorelands & Environmental Assistance Program (Ecology) appreciates the opportunity to provide scoping comments to Washington State Ferries (WSF) for the Keystone Project Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). WSF outreach media and summary materials are well prepared and provide a solid foundation for public participation in the EIS process.

Ecology has reviewed the following materials in preparation for these scoping comments:
- PURPOSE AND NEED STATEMENT (dated March 27th, 2006)
- WSF PROJECT FACT SHEET (WSF – website)
- PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES FOR KEYSTONE (WSF – website)
- ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS (WSF – website)
- ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES (WSF – website)
- POTENTIAL BENEFITS (WSF – website)

Shoreline Management Act (SMA):
The Washington State Shoreline Management Act (SMA) pursuant to RCW 90.58 provides 10 general goals for which local jurisdictions are tasked with furthering through creation and implementation of a local shoreline master program. Projects such as the proposed improvements to the Keystone Ferry terminal should be evaluated in a manner that balances the stated goals to protect the public's interest to the greatest degree possible. These goals revolve around preservation, protection and restoration of: (1) water dependent uses, (2) public access for recreation to the shoreline, (3) shoreline ecological functions, (4) public rights to navigation, (5) historical cultural resources, (6) coordination in planning for public facilities/utilities, (7) minimize flood damage, (8) private property rights, (9) accommodations to residential uses, and (10) coordination of shoreline management with other local, state and federal agencies.

Comments on scoping materials:
PURPOSE AND NEED STATEMENT / WSF PROJECT FACT SHEET/ PRELIMINARY PROJECT ALTERNATIVES:
It is Ecology's understand that WSF has initiated this process in anticipation of future growth and an increased Level of Service (LOS) required for the Port Townsend/Keystone route coupled with an aging ferry fleet and facility that is overdue for replacement. In this pursuit WSF has identified the following project alternatives to be analyzed within the EIS:

A. RELOCATION OF THE JETTY 300 FEET TO THE EAST TO ACCOMMODATE A LARGER VESSEL. THE LARGER VESSEL WOULD HAVE THE CAPACITY OF BETWEEN 124-144 VEHICLES
B. EXTEND THE JETTY 600 FEET INTO THE WATER AND WIDEN THE HARBOR TO THE WEST TO ACCOMMODATE A LARGER VESSEL. THE LARGER VESSEL WOULD HAVE A CAPACITY OF BETWEEN 124-144 VEHICLES.
C. USE THE EXISTING HARBOR AND ACQUIRE A NEW UNIQUE VESSEL WITH A SPECIAL PROPULSION SYSTEM THAT WOULD ALLOW IT TO OPERATE IN THE EXISTING KEYSTONE HARBOR.
D. USE THE EXISTING HARBOR AND TERMINAL AND ACQUIRE NEW VESSELS THAT ARE SIMILAR IN SIZE TOTHE EXISTING STEEL ELECTRICS.

Based on the identified need for the project and development of project alternatives, Ecology would encourage WSF to further define the demographics of current and anticipated ridership on the Port Townsend/Keystone route ridership analysis should first identify levels of satisfaction with current services along with the intended use of service i.e. vacation travel, commuting, recreation etc. WSF has stated that in 2005, "239 cancellations on the route were due to low tides…and 52 weather cancellations". It is not clear to Ecology what percentage of the annual number of trips this disruption represents nor is it clear if these statistics represent a normal frequency of cancellations based on past years of operation? Fundamentally, Ecology suggests that WSF analyze the significance of the cancellations considering both passenger expectations along with required infrastructure improvements to the Keystone basin to reduce tide closures.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS:
The list of environmental factors to be studied appears generally consistent with all State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) elements listed in WAC 173-27-444. It is assumed by Ecology that WSF is not proposing to limit the scope of the EIS from any of the listed SEPA elements. Pursuant to the general goals of the SMA as well as consistency with the local shoreline master programs in Island County and the City of Port Townsend, Ecology would like to emphasize the importance of analysis pertaining to the following SEPA environment elements (WAC 197-11-444):

· (1,d) Plants & Animals: consideration of habitats for plants, fish & wildlife. Specifically, the proposed expansion of holding areas as well as any in-water development such as changes to the existing jetty or shorelines within the Keystone basin. Lastly, Crockett Lake provides for valuable habitat for a variety of wildlife species that should be considered within the proposed alternatives;

· (2,b) Land and Shoreline Use, (2,c) Transportation, (2,d) Public Services: Because the Keystone basin is bordered on both sides by state park land, protection/enhancement of visual and physical access for recreation of the shoreline should be a major consideration within the project alternatives considered. Project alternatives A-D propose expansion of the existing holding area waterward of the existing parking area, thus displacing more shoreline recreational area. It is anticipated that increases in use of the route during the high season (summer) as well as consideration of a larger vessel has prompted review of an expanded holding area. It is not clear if under alternatives C & D (similar size vessel) if the expanded holding area is necessary. If in fact expansion to the existing vehicle holding area is necessary, Ecology would encourage WSF to consider alternative areas for expansion outside of valuable shoreline recreation area.

Lastly, consistency review of proposed alternatives compared to both the Port Townsend and Island County (Keystone) shoreline master programs should be incorporated into the EIS analysis.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:
In addition to the 10 issues listed, Ecology would encourage WSF to add "Aesthetic Impacts" to the list of environmental issues for consideration within the EIS. Issues with recreational uses in the shoreline should be expanded from the identified Fort Casey State Park and dive park to also consider impacts to day users of the shoreline including the launch facility and casual beach walkers.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS:
In addition to the "Potential Benefits" listed, Ecology would suggest that the following statement/goals be added:
· Improved recreational access (visual & physical) to the shoreline;
· Overall reduction in potential 'cumulative environmental impacts' associated with on-going maintenance along with preservation/enhancement of shoreline ecological functions.

ADDITIONAL ALTERNATIVES:
Ecology recommends that you explore a range of alternatives, including offsite alternatives, in the EIS. If reasonable

alternatives are not examined in the EIS, Ecology is concerned that requirements of WAC 197-11-440 (5) may not be met.

If you have any questions regarding comments on shoreline issues please contact Joe Burcar at (425) 649-7145 or jobu461@ecy.wa.gov. Questions regarding SEPA comments can be directed to myself at (360) 407-7503 or kstr461@ecy.wa.gov

---

06ScopingID:	**Organization:**	**Comment Date:**	**Scoping Categories:**
52	Intertribal Consultation	5/19/2006	Geology & Soils Historic, Cultural, Archeological Local Traffic Wildlife & Vegetation

Comment Source:
Community Briefing

Comment:

Charlie O'Hara (Swinomish) indicated that there is information that two village sites were located at the base of the cliffs of Fort Casey, one inland and one on the water. There was discussion regarding maps available from Washington D.C. that describe the original landscape when Fort Casey was under construction. Perhaps we should look into obtaining such maps.

Garth Baldwin discussed ways of conducting exploratory work: trenching vs. drilling. General comments included trenching not being feasible beyond a particular depth due to depth to ground water. Perhaps a combination of trenching and soil borings was necessary.

Dennis Lewarch (Suquamish) talked about Fort Casey. Discussed an article by Brian Sherrad and Kelsey that talked about a series of villages, a fault line, and a shift in land upward/downward. Calibration of the uplift is recorded on the South Whidbey Island fault line. Dennis recommended that we use a boring technology that was used at the King County Brightwater facility called Roto-sonic.

Garth Baldwin opined that he did not think there was a high likelihood that this option would encounter significant cultural resources.

Various Tribal Representatives within the group thought there was a high likelihood that this option would encounter significant cultural resources.

Garth Baldwin gave his initial assessment of the land's history including areas in the vicinity (along Crockett Lake) known to have had villages. Garth described the geology of the area and what he knows of the archeology of the region.

After viewing the campground area, the group walked over to the proposed expanded holding area. Doug Playter indicated that the expanded holding area would include stormwater drainage that does not currently exist.

Chris (Lummi) asked if it were possible to limit excavations. Stormwater pipes and catch basins will need to be placed approximately 3-feet deep every so often. Using permeable asphalt was a recommendation from tribal participants.

There was general concern regarding excavating 44-feet deep. Joe Washington, Lummi Nation indicated that it is "not one of the better options". Swinomish tribe representatives indicated they wouldn't like a "big dig". It was mentioned regarding such a "big dig" that "WSF is going to end up paying for it". What was implied was that the repercussions could be enormous.

Garth indicated that in order to scope the cultural resource survey correctly, we would need to determine the natural land surface. This could be determined through borings. There was a discussion of the benefits of traditional 1 1/2" diameter borings vs. 4" diameter borings. It was recommended that borings be done with 50-foot spacing. The 4" rotor sonic drill appeared to have certain advantages over the smaller or split spoon option.

Robert (Lummi) recommended Tribal representatives be invited to accompany drillers.

The group then walked over to the terminal building site. Doug Playter described the fourth alternative in which the terminal building would be relocated 150-feet east to a former terminal location (pre-1979). Holding location would be similar to that of the other alternatives.

Terminal building includes slab on grade foundation. The site currently contains approximately 5-feet of fill. Presently, there is a septic system. We'll have to study what type of system we'll have in the future.

The group then walked over to the 4th alternative site. The question came up, "if the project option to widen to the east were selected, what would happen to the parking lot? What would the Park do for parking?" This is something that will have to be determined in the analysis. Would they expand? Be able to operate with a reduced parking lot?

It was the general opinion of many that more excavation was involved in the 3rd option, widening into the campground, though this by no means implied that widening to the east would not be problematic. Doug Playter opined that he thought both widening excavations were similar in terms of the amount of material needing to be removed.

The Tribes recommended three archeological firms for consideration: BOAS, NW Archeology, and Equinox. There was also discussion regarding Montgomery Watson, Jacobs, Point Wells, CH2M Hill.

Ruston talked again about 20-40 thousand cubic yards needing to be excavated in September. This would be the 7th - 10th time the Corps is dredging the harbor in such a fashion. The dredge material is typically placed on the opposite side of the jetty to restore the beach that gets eroded. The bluff, located to the west, nourishes the dredge material. The beach configuration hasn't changed much in 100 years. Material is placed as far into the water as the -3 foot elevation (below water).

Joe Washington (Lummi Nation) indicated that the Lummi Nation has a strong tradition of coming to this site to collect gooseberries and wild onion. Dennis (Suquamish) indicated that there might be some native plant surveys for the region.

In closing, Michelle offered to share the draft scope of work for archeologists with the Tribes for review and comment. The tribal representatives indicated that WSF is asking the Tribes to look at a lot of information at the same time.

06ScopingID:	**Organization:**	**Comment Date:**	**Scoping Categories:**
53	Island Properties Management	5/17/2006	Alternative A: Jetty 300' East Alternative B: Jetty Extended Alternative C: Propulsion System Vessel Alternative D: Keystone Special Vessel Economics Local Traffic Transportation
Comment Source: Mail			

Comment:

Dear Hadley:
I am sorry that I was not able to attend the public meeting scheduled on May 9, 2006 in Port Townsend. As I understand it, one of the agenda items was a discussion regarding the size of ferries planned for the Port Townsend - Keystone route. From a review of most of the comments made from other citizens I will echo many of their concerns about using the larger 130 car ferry for year round use as opposed to two (2) 65 car ferries during the peak tourist season and reducing it to one (1) in the off season. On behalf of Port Townsend Plaza Limited Partnership I am going to lobby for using the smaller 65 car ferries for the following reasons:

1. One argument for a single 130 car ferry is that it will be able to carry more and for less. I submit that the reduced costs for the 130 car ferries provided in the cost analysis outlined in the WSF Vessel Planning and The Keystone Route Decision is incomplete and a truer picture of the costs should be presented on the annual operating expenses as opposed to the cost per car basis. The analysis states that the cost per car is $2.92 for the 130 car Issaquah and $4.41 for the 65 car Steel Electric. The assumption for these values is the ferries operate at full capacity. This is a false assumption as there are a number of trips that I have been on where the ferry has maybe 10 to 15 cars. As such, and using the values provided, at $2.92 per for the 130 cars the cost per trip is $379.00 for the Issaquah class ferry. For the Steel Electric it is $4.41 per car for 65 cars or $286.65 per crossing.

A. During the peak months (mid May through mid October or 5 months of the year) the cost to operate the Issaquah class for the 20 crossings per day is about $7,592.00 or $1,161,567.00 for the 153 day peak season and $1,609,504 for the 212 day off-season for a total annually of $2,771,080.00.

B. By contrast operating the two 65 car Steel Electrics during the peak season and reducing to one in the off

season the costs are: Peak 32 crossings per day for $9,172.80 per day for the 153 days for a total of $1,403,438.40 peak season and 20 trips per day for the 212 day off season or $5,733.00 per day which equates to $1,215,396.00 for a total annually of $2,618,834.40.

C. Based on the above it will cost roughly $152,245.60 per year to operate the 130 car Issaquah class ferries and there will not be any increase in the number of cars transported.

2. Aside from the cars that are transported, there are a number of pedestrian passengers that desire to cross. These numbers vary, but in the peak season the numbers do increase. As a pedestrian using the ferry system having to wait for an hour and a half between crossings with little to do on the Keystone side is frustrating at best and is too long of a wait.

3. By using the 130 car ferry every hour and a half a major concern is the influx of vehicular traffic into Port Townsend at one time. The town, especially during tourist season, is short on parking and infusing 2/3 of the 130 cars or 87 vehicles at one time into Port Townsend will cause traffic delays and will not allow for the turn-over in parking spaces that may occur between the smaller ferry loads spaced at 45 minute intervals.

4. With longer times between ferries the demands for the "kiss and drop" parking will potentially be larger placing a further strain on the limited parking available to the patrons of Port Townsend Plaza. Since this parking area is the closes location for this activity I feel safe in making the assumption that there will be an added burden placed on our parking lot to accommodate these riders.

5. Currently during the peak season when one of the ferries experiences mechanical problems the number of ferries available to continue service normally drops to one ferry or 65 cars every hour and a half. If we shift to one larger ferry and it experiences mechanical failure the number of cars and passengers to be transported will be zero. This would be an unacceptable situation.

6. Using only one ferry to make a crossing every hour and a half, especially during peak season, will add greatly to the burden placed on the traffic holding area and does not improve on the number of vehicles transported. As it is, the holding line on the Keystone side can extend out through the Fort Casey area. With two ferries running this line is at least kept somewhat in check and show signs of movement every 45 minutes. This is also true of the Port Townsend holding area.

7. The terminal modifications are also a factor. With the smaller ferries the need for extensive modifications will be limited which equates to a reduction in costs associated with the modifications.

8. The plan shows a need for two ferries on this route by the year 2030. If the decision remains to proceed with the larger 130 car ferry for year round service, and that improving the service is the justification for such, I submit that now is the time to increase the service during the peak season and continue to operate at least one of the smaller 65 car ferries in conjunction with the 130 car ferry. This will: have the effect of increasing the potential number of cars moved by an additional 65 cars per hour and a half; keep the traffic moving; and will result in reducing the holding lines during those high traffic periods. An improvement in service in the off season does not address the current needs of the higher traffic experienced during the peak tourist season, does not increase the flow or movement of riders, does not result in increased ridership nor does it ease the strain on the holding areas. During these peak periods there should be no less than two (2) ferries operating on the Keystone-Port Townsend route.

9. During the off season there are relatively few crossings that place a demand on the limitation of the smaller ferries and could justify the use of a larger capacity ferry. Typically they are the first couple crossings in the morning (especially when there is a fog or low tide cancellation), in the late afternoon around 4:30 to 6:00 pm, and the Friday afternoon runs. Most riders know about this delay and plan for it. These few instances do not justify using a larger ferry for full time use during the off season.

10. Some of the comments have advocated moving the terminal to an out of town location. I do not recommend this as an option. Port Townsend is a small town with parking problems. Keeping the ferry terminal within reasonable walking distance, in its present location, will relieve the potential increase in vehicular riders since many leave their vehicles at the Keystone terminal and walk on for a day trip to Port Townsend. Moving the terminal out of walking distance will potentially mean more of those walk on riders will consider taking their vehicle so they may drive to and from the ferry. This further strains the vehicular flow and adds to congestion at both ends. Keeping the ferry terminal at its present location is vital to the town and a key component of the tourist industry for Port Townsend.

If you have any questions feel free to contact me.

06ScopingID:	Organization:	Comment Date:	Scoping Categories:
54	Swinomish Tribe	3/16/2006	Alternative C: Propulsion System Vessel Alternative D: Keystone Special Vessel Fisheries Historic, Cultural, Archeological

Comment Source:
Community Briefing

Comment:

Lorraine Loomis indicated that Whidbey Island is the traditional homeland of the 4 tribes that make up the Swinomish. There are known and recorded Swinomish tribal village sites on the beaches all around the Island. For this reason, Lorraine indicated that the Swinomish Tribe should have primacy for determining tribal issues associated with the Keystone Project.

Larry Wasserman indicated that the meeting minutes from the intertribal meeting held February 24th inaccurately stated that he had a preference for the in-harbor options. He pointed out that Charlie Torres had stated on February 24th that the WSF captains had a preference, but that he did not.

Larry went on to state that WSF should analyze at least one out-of-the-harbor option at Keystone, to create a more balanced environmental document. He stated that without an out-of-the-harbor option, it will be impossible to correctly weigh the impacts of either of the options that lead to significant dredging. If the in-harbor options associated with the larger vessel require environmental impacts, an analysis of an option at a new location outside of the harbor will help the Tribe to determine which alternative has acceptable impacts, overall. This is particularly critical when considering impacts to fisheries resources.

Nicole McIntosh pointed out that the project currently is analyzing two alternatives that will not impact the harbor significantly (the smaller vessels). Charlie Torres and Doug Playter explained the analyses that have been done to reach the four alternatives being brought into the SEPA scoping period. They explained that the project team had researched several options outside of the harbor, but that those options were rejected because of issues such as currents in Admiralty Inlet, shallow near shore depths requiring extensive overwater coverage, and public outcry (Keystone Ferry Terminal Relocation Feasibility Study, August 2003). They further explained that the Washington State Legislature mandated that only alternatives within the current harbor be studied which led to the Keystone Harbor Study issued in January 2005. Charlie pointed out that the out-of-the-harbor options did not receive extensive review prior to being rejected.

Stan Walsh requested that we revisit the out-of-harbor alternatives, and specifically requested that we not limit those alternatives based on current ferry service needs (an approximately 45 minute run). He pointed out that if we are prepared to analyze options that will require more frequent boat trips to manage ridership capacity issues, we should also analyze options that would require less boat trips to manage ridership capacity issues (the larger boat) but on a different schedule.

Lorraine indicated that for the Swinomish Tribe, the Anacortes Project and the Keystone project are a priority. Lorraine indicated that Astrida Bulkis-Onat, of BOAS, is an archeologist that the Swinomish Tribe highly recommends be utilized to do the Cultural Resources Survey for the Keystone Project. Garth Baldwin indicated that BOAS has an excellent geo-archeologist, Phil LeTourneau, who has the background in the type of 3-D analysis that will need to be surveyed for this project Garth indicated that hiring consultants based upon the wishes of the tribes has not always worked out. WSDOT has done this in the past and it sometimes did not come to a good end for any of the parties.

Will Stelle discussed in general the approach that WSF had developed on the topic of Tribal reimbursements in informal discussions with the Suquamish staff. He then asked if Lorraine wished to discuss the approach generally, or whether she would like a copy of the proposed MOA in its current form. Lorraine expressed a desire to see the MOA in its current form, and Will provided her with a copy. Lorraine promised to look at it at the beginning of the week.

Kerry Ruth indicated that she would like to speak with the Swinomish Tribe about the Mukilteo Project, but as that was not the purpose of the meeting, she limited her discussion to information about the upcoming cultural resource work and offered to share the consultant's scope for that work with the Tribe. Nicole gave a brief update on the Anacortes project and indicated that although there is concern about archeological resources at the site, the project is not proposing to do any ground disturbing activities near archeological resources.

06ScopingID:	Name:	Comment Date:	Scoping Categories:
55	Tulalip Tribe	4/4/2006	Alternative A: Jetty 300' East Alternative B: Jetty Extended Historic, Cultural, Archeological Water Resources Wildlife & Vegetation

Comment Source:
Community Briefing

Comment:
Hank Gobin felt the bronze canoe and display board sound like WSF is trying to buy the Tribe. He indicated that WSF needs to recognize the Tulalip Tribes sovereignty. He stated that the treaty Tribes in Washington State have been treated like they're 2nd class citizens and have no say. He said WSF needs to study the history of the treaties. Hank described a recent proposal to the Tulalip Tribes to provide cultural resources education at the casino by showing a video of the history of the Tulalip Tribes on the big screens typically used for major sports events. He stated that his impression was that people don't go to casinos to learn about the Tribes, but that casino employees indicated that they are being asked questions about the Tribe. Therefore, the Tribe is going to provide cultural resource education to those employees interested. Hank then went on to indicate that the Port Townsend project would be better served by a kiosk that had video opportunities. This video should be done by Indian people for Indian people. It could be a tribal history project that includes the many varied tribes in this area.

Hank requested that we talk about longhouses in the area. His office has been looking for this information and hasn't been able to obtain it. It would be good for us to include this information in our cultural resources report so it could be shared with everyone. He suggested that there is a strong cultural connection to longhouses in Port Townsend.

Hank indicated that our cultural resources report needs not be limited to archeology, but also speak to cultural and historic perspectives from the Tribes.

Hank stated that the northern Puget Sound is still pristine and that our project needs to maintain water quality in Admiralty Inlet, as impacts will affect shellfish and salmon resources. He indicated that he was shocked at the water quality problems from operating a ferry terminal facility at Mukilteo.

Hank asked how we handle waste on the vessels. Charlie responded that all waste is collected and then discharge at terminals with facilities to handle this type of waste. At this location, that would be the Port Townsend Ferry Terminal.

Hank indicated that we need to do a wildlife assessment for wildlife associated with Fort Casey, such as coyote, red fox, birds, waterfowl, sandpipers, and killdeer.

Hank requested that we look at ways to enhance wildlife at Keystone. He said we should show that we're sensitive to natural resources by including measures to preserve, protect, and enhance these resources.

Hank asked what the history of Crockett Lake is.

Inez Bill is very concerned with impacts associated with Alternative A due to potential impacts to the area to the south of the terminal which has unique ethnobotany. There are not many areas in Washington where Tribes can harvest culturally significant plants, such as the wild rose, and many species within the Park are close to being extinct. These plants are very delicate and fragile and need to be preserved.

Inez also indicated that this area is an important source for agates, a stone culturally important to the Tribe.

Inez indicated that there are potential village sites in the area south of the harbor and near shore.

Hank indicated that the Tribe would prefer alternatives that do not change the harbor. He stated that we need to maintain the integrity of the area.

Hank indicated that a 4" boring will provide more significant data than a 1 ½" boring for the initial screening for cultural resources.

Inez requested additional information about the underwater conservation area. Michelle indicated that WSF had been provided some photos of the area from a local dive group and she'd share those with the Tribe.

06ScopingID:	Organization:	Comment Date:	Scoping Categories:
56	N/A	3/28/2006	Alternative C: Propulsion System Vessel Alternative D: Keystone Special Vessel Energy

Comment Source:
Comment Form

What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Drainage problems caused by expansion of parking lot. Use of alternative fuels for ferries, perhaps aided by solar or wind power.

Are there other alternative WSF should consider?

Prefer options C and D (using small boats and not expanding the harbor

Please comment on the purpose and need for this project:

Would question the projected population and ridership growth. No new industries being established in nearby areas. Tourism may not rise to projected levels as cost of fuel increases, economy (possibly) declines.

06ScopingID:	Organization:	Comment Date:	Scoping Categories:
57	N/A	4/28/2006	Alternative A: Jetty 300' East Alternative B: Jetty Extended Fisheries Geology & Soils Marine Waterways Transportation Wildlife & Vegetation Purpose & Need

Comment Source:
Comment Form

What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Interruption of nearshore sediment transport processes from both alternatives A and B. All alternatives have potential impacts to migrating juvenile salmon that use Lake Crockett for rearing and refuge functions. WSF should consider realigning the channel between Lake Crockett and the harbor to minimize interactions between docked vessels and migrating fish. If alternatives A or B are developed, plans for periodic bypassing of accreted sediments should be incorporated into terminal maintenance plans. Alternative B could cause additional "jetty effect" erosion to the beach north of the harbor because additional deflection of the longshore current.

Are there other alternative WSF should consider?

Each of the alternatives includes widening the vehicle staging area seaward of the existing. This will have some additional impact on beach fauna w/in the harbor. WSF should also consider the risk of relative sea level rise over the course of the project's expected life and whether the staging area would be at risk of catastrophic failure during high tide and storm conditions. Widening approaches on the main road should be considered for vehicle staging as an alternative.

Please comment on the purpose and need for this project:

The Keystone to Port Townsend route is a vital link in the summer tourist circuit especially for Whidbey Island and the Olympic Peninsula. Use projections seem reasonable and the current deficiencies in the service suggest a need for improved capacity, especially during the busy summer season.

06ScopingID:	Organization:	Comment Date:	Scoping Categories:
58	N/A	4/28/2006	Local Traffic Parks & Recreation

Comment Source:
Comment Form

What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

At issue is the increased traffic on Engle Road/South Main in Coupeville especially as it passes through the high school. Regardless of the signage, people will gravitate towards the shortest route rather than follow SR 20 the extra seven miles.

Are there other alternative WSF should consider?

Alternative A, which will enlarge harbor but preserve Ft. Casey camping area and allow the holding area to move further south. It is absolutely necessary to construct boats that can integrate into the ferry fleet and will carry more cars. The last two alternatives are really unacceptable because the boats would be too small for the projected traffic increase and still subject to the bad weather problem.

06ScopingID:	**Organization:**	**Comment Date:**	**Comment Categories:**
59	N/A	4/24/2006	Alternative C: Propulsion System Vessel Parks & Recreation Frequency/Schedule Type of Vessel Ebey's Landing National Historic Reserve

Comment Source:
Mail – Comment Form

Are there other alternative WSF should consider?

Option C - Lots of people use both the overnight camp area and the boat launch - both are very useful and unique spots - don't reduce them. 100 car ferries are big enough and the harbor doesn't have to change - perhaps run them later in the summer.

06ScopingID:	**Organization:**	**Comment Date:**	**Comment Categories:**
60	N/A	4/24/2006	Alternative C: Propulsion System Vessel Alternative D: Keystone Special Vessel Economics Local Traffic Parks & Recreation Frequency/Schedule Type of Vessel Reliability Improve Public Safety Increased Number of Vehicles

Comment Source:
Mail – Comment Form

What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Preserve dive park - do not disturb or pollute. Preserve campground - do not disturb or pollute area waterways. Do nothing to adversely affect Crockett Lake. 120-140 cars through Coupeville school area unacceptable - 1/2 ferry runs would impact businesses, events (concerts, festivals, sports), work schedules, etc at both ends.

Are there other alternative WSF should consider?

Alternatives C and D acceptable. Smaller ferries, continue sail schedule, improve terminal.

Please comment on the purpose and need for this project:

Safety. Reduce cancellations. Cutting runs by 1/2 does not serve the public.

06ScopingID:	Organization:	Comment Date:	Comment Categories:
61	N/A	4/24/2006	Alternative A: Jetty 300' East Alternative B: Jetty Extended Wildlife & Vegetation Proximity to SR 20/525

Comment Source:
Mail – Comment Form

Are there other alternative WSF should consider?
We favor Plan "A" as presented at Coupeville on 29 Mar 06. This plan seems to be the least disruptive to the area, and allows the same size ferry as plan "B". This option also relocates the boat launch - the other plans apparently eliminate it. We are glad that you have dropped any options that involved relocating the terminal farther east on Keystone Spit, which would destroy an entirely new area, and require changes to the highway(s).

06ScopingID:	Organization:	Comment Date:	Comment Categories:
62	N/A	4/24/2006	Alternative C: Propulsion System Vessel Economics Wildlife & Vegetation Parks & Recreation Type of vessel Frequency/Schedule

Comment Source:
Mail – Comment Form

What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?
The herons that like to nest on the landing pilings (left on the outgoing) at Keystone. Please consult with bird biologists to determine a non-intrusive alternative to destroying their nesting spot.

Are there other alternative WSF should consider?
Option "C" is best to me because the harbor remains the same size, we can have (2) two shallow draft 100-car ferries, with one every1 1/2 hour in winter and every 45 minutes in summer.

Please comment on the purpose and need for this project:
This alternative [C] seems wisest because the park for campers remains and the boat launch remains. We need two sturdy new 100 car ferries so our island won't become like I-5 - our rural lifestyle attracts a healthy tourist economy, etc. This will be a healthy compromise and will increase car-carrying capacity by about 45 cars.